



City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: July 17, 2006

TO: City Council

VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager

FROM: Deborah Woldruff, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT – The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan document (text and maps) that will set policy and guide the City's development over the next twenty years. Areas directly affected by the update project include all properties located within the City's corporate limits, and properties within the City's Sphere of Influence in the County unincorporated areas generally east and south of the City limits to the Redlands City limits and Riverside County Line.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is for the City Council to take the following actions:

1. Adopt Council Bill R-2005-55 (Attachment 1) for the General Plan Update Project Program Environmental Impact Report, which:
 - a. Adopts and Approves the Findings for Statements of Overriding Considerations (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15091, 15092, and 15093) for the significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to Air Quality, Loss of Open Space, Biological Resources, Water Supply, and Traffic and Circulation that would result from implementation of the General Plan (June 2006); and,
 - b. Approve and Certify the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which includes the Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Program based on the Findings.

Copies of the Findings of Fact for the Loma Linda General Plan and Related Actions (June 13, 2006), Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Loma Linda General Plan and Related Actions (June 13, 2006), and Draft Final General Plan (June 2006) were previously distributed for the June 13, 2006 City Council Meeting.

BACKGROUND

On June 13, 2006, the City Council continued the General Plan Update Project to July 17, 2006 for certification of the Draft Final Program Environmental Impact Report. Final actions on the Draft General Plan June 2006 are scheduled for a meeting on July 25, 2006.

Additional background information on the General Plan Update Project is available in the City Council and Planning Commission Staff Reports that were previously distributed.

ANALYSIS

The Draft Final Program EIR that was prepared for the Loma Linda General Plan Update Project evaluates the potential impacts of General Plan implementation. Through the review process, particularly at the City Council level, the Draft General Plan has undergone considerable revision in terms of reducing proposed residential densities and the intensity of commercial and non-residential development. For this reason, the Draft Final Program EIR more than adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts and issues related to General Plan implementation.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15004(a) requires that a Lead Agency consider a final EIR, Negative Declaration or other environmental document (as appropriate) prior to granting any approval of a project subject to CEQA. Certification of the Draft Final Program EIR in advance of final actions on the Draft General Plan is in compliance with the previous citation.

ENVIRONMENTAL

The General Plan Update Project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) (March 22, 2004) was prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of the project. The DEIR and Draft Responses to Comments that were received during the 45-day mandatory public review period were reviewed by the City Council on October 12, 2004. Due to significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to Air Quality, Loss of Open Space, Biological Resources, Water Supply, and Traffic and Circulation that would result from implementation of the General Plan, Findings for Statements of Overriding Considerations have been prepared for the City Council's consideration (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15091, 15092, and 15093).

The project is also subject to the Regional Congestion Management Plan (CMP) and Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared to address the CMP requirements. The Council completed its review of the CMP TIA (May 13, 2004) and certified the document at the meeting on October 11, 2005.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Other than the costs associated with the preparation of the Draft General Plan and related environmental documents, the financial impacts of the General Plan Update are unknown at this time.

ATTACHMENTS (Previously distributed on June 13, 2006)

1. Council Bill R-2005-55 – Certification of the Final Program Environmental Impact Report
Exhibits:
 - A. Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Program) - CD
 - B. Findings of Fact for the Loma Linda General Plan and Related Actions (June 13, 2006)
 - C. Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Loma Linda General Plan and Related Actions (June 13, 2006)
2. Council Bill R-2005-57 – Adopting all Elements of the General Plan (June 2006)
Exhibits:
 - A. Draft Final General Plan (June 2006)
 - B. Existing Setting Report (June 5, 2002) – CD
3. LSA Associates Focused Traffic Studies
Exhibits:
 - A. Supplemental Operational Analysis of the General Plan Intersections (January 18, 2006)
 - B. Revised Existing Level of Service Analysis (February 7, 2006)
4. Responses to Comments on the Loma Linda General Plan Update Final Program EIR Received After the Public Comment Period on the Draft EIR
Exhibits:
 - A. Letter A – Dr. Timothy P. Krantz, San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (June 27, 2005)
 - B. Letter B – Lisa Belenky, Center for Biological Diversity (June 6, 2005)
 - C. Letter C – Kathy Glendrange, DVM, JD, Save Loma Linda (November 8, 2005)
 - D. Letter D – Raymond W. Johnson, Johnson & Sedlack on behalf of Save Loma Linda (April 18, 2006)
5. Correspondence on the Draft General Plan (October 2005 and June 2006) Received from November 2005 through June 2006
Exhibits:
 - A. Kathy Glendrange, DVM, JD, Save Loma Linda (November 8, 2005)
 - B. Joseph S.C. Bonadiman, P.E., Joseph E. Bonadiman & Associates (March 31, 2006)

PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED DOCUMENTS

1. Draft General Plan (October 2004); Draft Land Use Element (April 2005); Draft Hillside Conservation Designation (Revised June 1, 2005); Draft South Hills Designation (October 25, 2005); and, Draft Final General Plan (October 2005)
2. Draft Existing Setting Report (June 5, 2002)
3. Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (March 22, 2004)
4. Traffic Impact Analysis (May 13, 2004) (CMP document); and, Revised Trip Generation Analysis Report (October 4, 2005);
5. Draft Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Response to Comments, Mitigation Monitoring Report) (June 21, 2004); and, Comment Letters (CBD, SBVAS, and Rutan & Tucker) and City's Responses

6. City Council Staff Reports (October 12, 2004; November 16, 2004; December 7, 2004; December 14, 2004; January 11, 2005; February 1, 2005; February 8, 2005; February 22, 2005; March 8, 2005; April 12, 2005; April 26, 2005; May 17, 2005; June 7, 2005, June 28, 2005; July 26, 2005; August 16, 2005; October 11, 2005; October 25, 2005; November 8, 2005; November 15, 2005; December 6, 2005; January 10, 2006; January 24, 2006; February 28, 2006; April 18, 2006; May 23, 2006; and, June 13, 2006)
7. Planning Commission Staff Reports (April 6, 2005)

I:\General Plan Update\Staff Reports\CC\CC - 2006\CC 07-17-06sr FPEIR.doc

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOMA LINDA
ADOPTING THE FINDINGS FOR STATEMENTS OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATION, CERTIFYING THE FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVING THE MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT

SECTION I. RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted the General Plan for the City of Loma Linda by Resolution No. 105 on September 11, 1973; and

WHEREAS, in May 2001, the City determined that the General Plan Update Project required the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report due to the size and scope of the project, and the potential environmental effects that could result from implementation of a new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, on May 10, 2001, the City Council approved an Agreement for Professional Services between the City and LSA Associates, Inc. for the preparation of the General Plan and Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the General Plan Update Project; and

WHEREAS, on October 30, 2003, the City released the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Program EIR to the public, responsible agencies and other interested persons for their concerns and comments, opened a thirty (30) day public review period from November 3, 2003 to December 3, 2003, and held a public scoping meeting on November 12, 2003 to solicit public comments on the preparation of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the City's Administrative Review Committee (the "ARC") reviewed the General Plan Update Project and NOP at many meetings from June 2001 through January 2004; and

WHEREAS, on January 27, 2004 the ARC forwarded the General Plan Update Project to the Planning Commission with recommendations for approval; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Program EIR was prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the General Plan Update Project and the Notice of Completion and Availability (NOC/A) of the DEIR

was released on March 22, 2004 for the commencement of a forty-five (45) day public review period that ended on May 6, 2004, and made available to the public, responsible agencies and other interested persons for their review and comment as required by CEQA; and

WHEREAS, oral and written comments were received on the DEIR during the NOC period and these comments were responded to both orally and in writing as required by CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted noticed public hearings on February 11, 2004, March 3, 2004, March 17, 2004, March 31, 2004, April 7, 2004, April 28, 2004, May 5, 2004, May 19, 2004, June 23, 2004, July 21, 2004, August 4, 2004, August 25, 2004, September 15, 2004, September 29, 2004, October 20, 2004, and November 10, 2004 in order to review the DEIR and General Plan Update Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed Mitigation Monitoring Plan and found it to be in compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after receiving public testimony, recommended to the City Council the preparation and adoption of Findings for Statements of Overriding Consideration, Certification of the Final Program EIR, and approval of the Mitigation Monitoring; and

WHEREAS, the City Council conducted noticed public hearings on October 12, 2004; November 16, 2004; December 7, 2004; December 14, 2004; January 11, 2005; February 1, 2005; February 8, 2005; February 22, 2005; March 8, 2005; April 12, 2005; April 26, 2005; May 17, 2005; June 7, 2005, June 28, 2005; July 26, 2005; August 16, 2005; October 11, 2005, October 25, 2005, November 8, 2005, November 15, 2005, December 6, 2005, January 10, 2006, January 24, 2006, February 28, 2006, April 18, 2006, May 23, 2006, and June 13, 2006 in order to fully review and consider the DEIR, Response to Comments, Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Findings for Statements of Overriding Consideration, Planning Commission Staff Reports, and Planning Commission and staff recommendations.

SECTION II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND AND DETERMINED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOMA LINDA HEREBY CERTIFIES:

- A. The Program Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update Project has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The FEIR (including the DEIR, Response to Comments, Mitigation Monitoring Plan) and all the evidence and information referenced herein and attached as Exhibit A;
- B. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), prepared for the General Plan Update Project as part of the DEIR, is in compliance with the Regional Congestion Management Plan and was approved by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) on May 11, 2004 and certified by the City Council on October 11, 2005 as the City's Master TIA;
- C. The FEIR was presented to the City Council who reviewed and considered the information in the FEIR prior to approving the General Plan Update Project, which includes the General Plan text and maps, and Existing Setting Report;
- D. The analysis in the FEIR is a worst case analysis in that the residential densities throughout the planning area (City and Sphere of Influence) have been significantly reduced by the City Council during the public hearing process as indicated by the General Plan Build Out Housing Estimate of Total Dwelling Units, which was reduced from 17,231 to 15,052;
- E. The FEIR has identified all significant environmental effects of the General Plan Update Project in the 6092.81 acre planning area;
- F. Although the FEIR identifies certain significant environmental effects that would result if the General Plan Update Project is implemented and future development occurs within the planning area, all significant effects that can feasibly be avoided or mitigated will be avoided or mitigated by the implementation of the mitigation measures as set forth in the

Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the FEIR. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan and all information contained therein is included in the FEIR and incorporated herein by reference;

- G. Potential mitigation measures and other project alternatives not incorporated into or adopted as part of the General Plan Update Project, and project area were rejected as infeasible, based on specific economic, social, and/or other considerations as set forth in the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations (referenced herein and attached as Exhibit B, Findings Of Fact For The Loma Linda General Plan And Related Actions, and Exhibit C, Statement Of Overriding Considerations For the Loma Linda General Plan And Related Actions). The Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the FEIR, and all the evidence and information contained therein also are on file in the City Clerk's Office;
- H. Careful consideration has been given to the significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. The significant unavoidable adverse impacts are clearly outweighed by the economic, social, cultural and other benefits of the General Plan Update Project for the planning area, a 6092.81 acre area that includes the City of Loma Linda legal limits and Sphere of Influence, as set forth in the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- I. The findings contained in the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations with respect to the significant impacts identified in the FEIR are true and correct, and are based upon substantial evidence in the record, including documents comprising the FEIR.
- J. The Final Program Environmental Impact Report (which includes the DEIR, Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Plan), and the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations reflect the independent review, analysis and judgment of the City of Loma Linda.

SECTION III. CERTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND AND DETERMINED by the City Council of City of Loma Linda that the Final Program Environmental Impact Report is certified, the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Consideration are adopted, and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan is approved.

SECTION IV. NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

The Community Development Department, Planning Division is hereby directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County of San Bernardino Clerk of the Board of Supervisors certifying the City's compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act in preparing, adopting, and certifying the Final Program Environmental Impact Report and Findings for a Statement of Overriding Consideration, and approving the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. A copy of the Notice of Determination will be forwarded to the State Clearinghouse.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of July 2006 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent

Floyd Peterson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Pamela Byrnes-O'Camb, City Clerk

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR THE LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN AND RELATED ACTIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines provides that:

“No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been completed and which identified one or more significant environmental effects for the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rational for each finding.”

The *Loma Linda General Plan Update EIR* (State Clearinghouse #2003101159) identified significant or potential significant environmental impacts which, prior to mitigation, may occur as the result of implementation of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines, findings are enumerated in Section 3.0, below.

2.0 BACKGROUND FINDINGS

2.1 Initial Study/Notice of Preparation

To further the basic purposes of CEQA, the environmental review process requires the preparation and public circulation of several documents in addition to the General Plan Program EIR, which includes a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and an Initial Study. An NOP is a brief notice that the Lead Agency (in this case, the City of Loma Linda) plans to prepare an EIR for a project. The purpose of the NOP is to solicit guidance from agencies and individuals as to the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. An Initial Study is used to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment and is used to determine what type of CEQA environmental documentation is appropriate (i.e., Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, EIR, etc.). CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a) states “If the lead agency can determine that an EIR will clearly be required for the project, an initial study is not required but may still be desirable.” In this case, the City of Loma Linda opted to not prepare an Initial Study since it was clear that the *Loma Linda General Plan Update* would require the preparation of an EIR.

The City of Loma Linda formally initiated the environmental process with circulation of an NOP, which was sent to responsible agencies and interested individuals for a 30-day review period from October 30 to December 3, 2003. The NOP identified that implementation of the proposed *City of Loma Linda General Plan Update* may have potentially significant environmental impacts on aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, water resources, land use and agriculture resources, flooding hazards, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities (fire protection, police protection, public educational facilities, library services, wastewater, solid waste, energy resources), transportation and circulation, and parks and recreation. The NOP determined that potential impacts associated with the aforementioned issues required further evaluation in the Program EIR for the proposed General Plan. In addition, it was determined that an evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan be included in the EIR.



Within 30 days after receiving the NOP, responsible agencies are to provide the Lead Agency with specific detail about the scope and content of the environmental information related to the responsible agency's area of statutory responsibility. This information must be included in the draft Program EIR. The NOP and the responses to the NOP from agencies and individuals are included in Appendix A of the Final EIR.

Scoping Process

In compliance with *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Loma Linda has taken steps to maximize opportunities for individuals, parties, and agencies to participate in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, various federal, State, regional and local government agencies, and other interested parties were contacted to solicit comments and to inform the public of the proposed General Plan. A public scoping meeting was held to solicit public comment on the General Plan EIR. This meeting was held on November 12, 2003, at the Loma Linda Senior Center, 25571 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

2.2 Draft EIR

The Draft EIR was prepared according to CEQA requirements to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed *City of Loma Linda General Plan Update*. It also discussed alternatives to the proposed General Plan and proposed mitigation measures that will offset, minimize, or otherwise avoid significant environmental impacts. The EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA, California Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*; the *Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act* (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3); and the rules, regulations, and procedures for implementing CEQA as adopted by the City of Loma Linda.

The EIR assumes full realization of the proposed General Plan policies through a build out year estimated to be 2030. The objective of the EIR is to inform City of Loma Linda decision-makers, representatives of other affected/responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental consequences that may be associated with the approval and implementation of the proposed General Plan. The EIR also examines various alternatives to the proposed General Plan and describes potential impacts relating to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods in which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided.

A Notice of Completion of a Draft Program EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse along with the required number of copies of the document for circulation to various State agencies. Copies of the Draft Program EIR (Draft EIR) were also mailed directly to local agencies, groups, and individuals for review. The Draft EIR was properly noticed and distributed and was available to the public at the City of Loma Linda Planning Department and the City Library for the required 45-day public review period (March 22 - May 6, 2004).

The primary objective and purpose of the EIR public review process is to obtain comments on the adequacy of the analysis of environmental impacts, the mitigation measures presented, and other analyses contained in the report. Responses were received via mail only. No e-mailed comments were received. A total of nine comment letters was received. Eight of the comment letters received were from State, regional, or local agencies. One comment letter was received from an individual.

2.3 Public Hearing Process

The City's Administrative Review Committee (the "ARC"), which is comprised of staff representatives from the City Administration, Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Information Systems Department, Redevelopment Agency, reviewed the General Plan Update Project and provided input to the Consultant at many meetings from June 2001 through January 2004.

The City and Consultant conducted 18 public workshops from July 2001 through April 2004 to obtain public input on the development of the Land Use Plan and Land Use Element, Circulation Master Plan and Transportation and Circulation Element, California Housing requirements and the Housing Element, and other mandatory and optional general plan elements.

In May 2003, the City made the first Draft General Plan (and all subsequent drafts) available to the public, local jurisdictions and counties, government agencies and other interested persons for their concerns and comments.

The Planning Commission conducted six study sessions of the Draft General Plan Land Use (2.0) and Community Design (3.0) Elements (May 2003) in open public meetings on July 7, 2003, August 6, 2003, August 20, 2003, September 10, 2003, October 1, 2003, and October 7, 2003 in an effort to comprehensively review the document and provide constructive comments to staff and the Consultant.

On January 27, 2004 the ARC forwarded the General Plan Update Project to the Planning Commission with recommendations for approval and adoption. The Planning Commission conducted noticed public hearings on February 11, 2004, March 3, 2004, March 17, 2004, March 31, 2004, April 7, 2004, April 28, 2004, May 5, 2004, May 19, 2004, June 23, 2004, July 21, 2004, August 4, 2004, August 25, 2004, September 15, 2004, September 29, 2004, October 20, 2004, and November 10, 2004 in order to review the Draft General Plan (various editions) and solicit public testimony and comments on the General Plan Update Project and related environmental documents.

The Planning Commission forwarded the bulk of the General Plan Update Project to the City Council on September 15, 2005, and forwarded the Draft Hillside Designation and Special Planning Areas Designations to the City Council on November 10, 2004, with recommendations for approval and adoption of the Draft General Plan (October 2005).

The City Council conducted noticed public hearings on October 12, 2004; November 16, 2004; December 7, 2004; December 14, 2004; January 11, 2005; February 1, 2005; February 8, 2005; February 22, 2005; March 8, 2005; April 12, 2005; April 26, 2005; May 17, 2005; June 7, 2005; June 28, 2005; July 26, 2005; August 16, 2005; October 11, 2005, October 25, 2005, November 8, 2005, November 15, 2005, December 6, 2005, January 10, 2006, January 24, 2006, February 28, 2006, April 18, 2006, May 23, 2006, and June 13, 2006 in order to fully review and consider the General Plan Update Project, which included the Draft General Plan (October 2004), Draft Program EIR, Response to Comments, Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Congestion Management Plan Traffic Impact Analysis (CMP TIA), Findings for Statements of Overriding Consideration, Planning Commission Staff Reports, Planning Commission and staff recommendations, and public testimony.

The City Council directed staff to hold a Joint Workshop of the City's Commissions, Committees, and Boards on March 12, 2006 to consider and evaluate three alternatives for inclusion in the Draft General Plan to address land use, open space, and development in the South Hills.

The results of the March 12, 2006 Workshop were presented to the City Council on April 18, 2006.

The City Council found that many of the proposed residential and mixed-use designations described in the Draft General Plan, Land Use Plan text and shown on the Land Use Plan Map would allow higher densities than usual for Loma Linda and directed that staff revise the plan to reduce densities throughout the 6,092.81 acre planning area that includes the City of Loma Linda legal limits and Sphere of Influence.

2.4 Final EIR

For the purposes of CEQA, and findings herein set forth, the administrative record for the Final EIR consists of the following documents:

- The Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Loma Linda General Plan and Technical Appendices (SCH No. 2003101159).
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIR (March 22, 2003 through May 6, 2004) and responses to those comments (June 21, 2004 and June 5, 2006).

The official custodian of the Final EIR is the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department:

City of Loma Linda
Community Development Department
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354
Phone: (909) 799-2830

2.5 Mitigation Monitoring Program

The mitigation monitoring program has been prepared for use in implementing the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR for the Loma Linda General Plan. The program has been prepared in compliance with State law by the City of Loma Linda.

The California Environmental Quality Act requires adoption of a reporting or monitoring program for those measures placed on a project to mitigate or avoid adverse effects on the environment. (Public Resource Code Section 21081.6) The law states that the reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.

The monitoring program contains the following elements:

1. The mitigation measures are recorded with the action and procedure necessary to ensure compliance. In some instances, one action may be used to verify implementation of several mitigation measures.
2. A procedure for compliance and verification has been outlined for each action necessary. This procedure designates who will take action, what action will be taken and when, and to whom and when compliance will be reported.
3. The program has been designed to be flexible. As monitoring progresses, changes to compliance procedures may be necessary based upon recommendations of those responsible for the program. As changes are made, new monitoring compliance procedures and records will be developed and incorporated into the program.

Section 5.0 of the Final EIR includes the mitigation monitoring program (MMP) prepared for the proposed General Plan. As required by State law (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6), the MMP has been prepared to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures adopted for the proposed General Plan by the City of Loma Linda. Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the adoption of a reporting or monitoring program for those conditions placed on a project to mitigate or avoid adverse effects on the environment.

2.6 Program EIR

The EIR for the Loma Linda General Plan is a "Program EIR," which evaluates the broad-scale impacts of the proposed General Plan. Program EIRs are typically prepared for an agency plan program, or series of actions that can be characterized as one large project, such as a general plan. Tiering refers to the concept of a multilevel approach to preparing environmental documents (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15152). A General Plan EIR, addressing the impacts of countywide and local policy decisions, can be thought of as a "first tier" document. It evaluates the large-scale impacts on the environment that can be expected to result from the adoption of the General Plan, but does not necessarily address the site-specific impacts that each of the thousands of individual development projects that will follow and implement the General Plan may have. CEQA requires each of those subsequent development projects be evaluated for their particular site-specific impacts. These site-specific analyses are typically encompassed in second-tier documents, such as Project EIRs, Focused EIRs, or Negative Declarations on individual development projects subject to the General Plan, which typically evaluate the impacts of a single activity undertaken to implement the overall plan.

According to the *CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15168(a)), a State or local agency should prepare a Program EIR, rather than a Project EIR, when the lead agency proposes the following:

- Series of related actions that are linked geographically;
- Logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program; or
- Individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

In this case, the Program EIR will address the General Plan, which is the proposed project. This EIR considers a series of actions needed to achieve the implementation of the proposed General Plan. Further actions or procedures required to allow implementation of the proposed General Plan include the processing of zoning plans, specific plans, tentative tract maps, site design plans, building permits, and grading permits.

In a Program EIR, CEQA allows the general analysis of broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgment that subsequent site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects of portions of the program at the time of project implementation.

The Program EIR will serve a valuable purpose as a first-tier environmental analysis. The Program EIR can be incorporated by reference into subsequently prepared environmental documents to address issues, such as cumulative impacts and growth inducing impacts, allowing the subsequent documents to focus on new or site-specific impacts (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 151168(d)).

Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, in practice there are considerable differences in level of detail. Program EIRs are typically more

conceptual and abstract. They contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures. The analysis in this Program EIR is not intended to be site-specific (e.g., determining impacts of projects on the level of service for specific intersections within the City or the impacts of future development projects on specific biological resources), but is a more broad analysis. For example, the biological resources analysis determines the cumulative impacts that will occur to biological resources with the implementation of the General Plan, but is not based on the detailed site-specific surveys that would be expected of subsequent development projects.

Overall, the Program EIR will help determine the need for subsequent environmental documentation. Parameters by which a lead agency can determine the need for additional environmental documentation are contained in the *CEQA Guidelines* (Sections 15160 to 15170).

2.7 Growth Inducement

CEQA requires a discussion of the ways in which the proposed general Plan could be growth inducing. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) identifies a project as growth inducing if it fosters economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. New employees from commercial and industrial development and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms of growth have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area. Examples of development that would indirectly facilitate growth include the installation of new roadways or the construction or expansion of water delivery/treatment facilities.

2.8 Cumulative Impacts

"Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time" (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355(b)). Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355). "The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future projects" (CEQA Guidelines, § 15355(b)).

The determination of a project's cumulative effects involves the identification of the following:

- Direct and indirect effects of the proposed action;
- Which resources, ecosystems, and human communities are affected; and
- Whether these effects are cumulatively important.

In a general sense, all impacts on affected resources are cumulative; however, it is the goal of this analysis to narrow the important issues to those of national, regional, or local significance.

An assessment of the cumulative impacts is done qualitatively since it is difficult to predict timing and density of future projects. Most future projects will be the subject of separate environmental studies.

Due to the broad project objectives associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan, the cumulative analysis presented in this Program EIR does not evaluate the site-specific impacts of individual projects. Project-level analysis will be prepared on a project-by-project basis. The proposed General Plan addresses cumulative growth anticipated to occur in Loma Linda and its General Plan

study area resulting from build out of the proposed General Plan in combination with growth throughout San Bernardino County.

The cumulative impact analysis is based on the anticipated population growth within San Bernardino County. Population growth is a major factor contributing to direct impacts on habitat, housing, job markets, transportation, and development. Additionally, these direct impacts can cause secondary impacts to biological resources, air quality, density, and the overall quality of life within Loma Linda. For this reason, using population growth as a measure to determine cumulative impacts is applicable when examining a large-scale policy action such as a General Plan.

2.9 Significant Irreversible Effects

Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the introduction of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses to lands that are currently undeveloped. Substantial development would occur within each of the General Plan mixed-use areas, and lands within the southern portions of the General Plan Study Area. These areas are currently characterized by low-density development and open space. The development of these areas would commit the City to sustaining relatively higher intensity uses within existing developed areas, providing new affordable housing, creation of transit-oriented development, and upgrading and revitalization of underutilized commercial areas. The General Plan would result in the infill of commercial and employment-generating uses, primarily within the mixed-use areas. General Plan implementation would also result in irreversible commitment of land to development within south hills. Development of these currently underutilized areas would provide significant housing and employment opportunities, assisting the City in meeting its future housing need, provide for transit-oriented development, and assist in providing mixed-use development opportunities that are not now available within Loma Linda.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the development of existing undeveloped and underdeveloped lands. Irreversible environmental changes that would result from such development would include potential degradation of existing biological and cultural resources, loss of aesthetic resources, and the installation of utility and roadway infrastructure. Although it is unlikely that a major hazardous waste release would occur in Loma Linda as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan, such a release would also constitute a significant irreversible change from an environmental action. The mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR address these impacts and would reduce such irreversible or nearly irreversible effects to less than significant levels.

Consumption of nonrenewable resources includes nonrenewable energy use. The implementation of proposed General Plan policies contained in the Public Services and Facilities Element would promote development proposals designed to reduce energy consumption. Maintaining sufficient local housing and employment opportunities, along with development of transit-oriented development would result in the conservation of fossil fuels. Therefore, the proposed General Plan would result in the efficient use of nonrenewable energy sources.

2.10 Consistency with Regional Plans

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(d), requires that any inconsistencies between a regionally significant project and regional plans be discussed. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional plans cover the proposed General Plan area and five other counties in Southern California. SCAG's regional plans that require a consistency discussion are the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan administered by SCAG. These are discussed below. Consistency with applicable Air Quality Management Plans and Air Quality

Attainment Plans, as well as the air quality State Implementation Plan, is discussed in the Draft EIR Section 4.3. Consistency with applicable Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans is discussed in the Draft EIR Section 4.5.

3.0 FINDINGS OF THE LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

As a result of the public hearing process (refer to Section 2.3 of these Findings), the General Plan was revised to reduce densities. The Draft EIR evaluated a more intense version of land uses and therefore evaluates the impacts of a worst case scenario. The Draft EIR evaluated the impacts of 17,231 dwelling units and 17,564 jobs. The proposed General Plan is currently proposing 15,052 dwelling units and 26,167 jobs. The Findings reflect this change in land use densities and the resulting dwelling units, population and employment.

3.1 Independent Judgment Finding

The City of Loma Linda retained LSA Associates, Inc., to prepare the EIR. The EIR was prepared under the direction and supervision of the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department, Planning Division with input from other City departments.

Finding: The Final EIR reflects the City's independent judgment. The City has exercised its independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3) in retaining its own environmental consultant, directing the consultant in preparation of the Final EIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant.

4.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of the project, which: (1) offer substantial environmental advantages over the project proposal, and (2) may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved. An EIR must only evaluate reasonable alternatives to a project which could feasibly attain most of the project objectives, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. In all cases, the consideration of alternatives is to be judged against a rule of reason. The lead agency is not required to choose the environmentally superior alternative identified in the EIR if the alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the project and (1) through the imposition of mitigation measures the environmental effects of a project can be reduced to an acceptable level, or (2) there are social economic, technological or other considerations which make the alternative infeasible.

The primary goal of the proposed General Plan is to provide residents of the City with a "blueprint" for future public and private development and for management of the community's natural environment. The proposed General Plan will act as the foundation upon which City leaders will make growth and land use-related decisions. The proposed General Plan expresses the community's goals with respect to human-made and natural environments and sets forth the policies and implementation measures to achieve them. The objective of the proposed General Plan is to achieve the vision of the City residents in conformance with State planning law. Loma Linda's vision is detailed in Chapter 2.0 of the proposed General Plan.

The analysis provided in Chapter 4.0 of the Draft EIR determined that air quality, loss of open space, biological resources, water supply and traffic/circulation impacts would remain significant after implementation of the proposed General Plan polices and mitigation. The alternatives analysis discusses how each alternative would avoid, reduce, or exacerbate the environmental effects of the proposed General Plan. It also discusses other, less than significant, impacts. The analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable goals, policies or mitigation measures associated with the proposed General Plan would be implemented with the proposed alternatives analyzed in this section. The No Project/Existing General Plan would assume build out under policies and implementing strategies of the current General Plan.

Where a significant impact can be substantially lessened (i.e., mitigated to an "acceptable level") solely by the adoption of the project and mitigation measures, the lead agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of alternatives with respect to that impact, even if the alternative would mitigate the impact to a greater degree than the proposed project (Public Resources Code, § 21002; *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 691, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403).

The Draft EIR and the Final EIR examined a reasonable range of alternatives to the project to determine whether any of these alternatives could meet most or all of the project's objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening its significant, unavoidable impacts (Draft EIR, p. 6-1).

Four alternatives that could potentially meet the project objectives were considered as part of the environmental review for the project:

- **No Project/No Build Alternative.** With this alternative, the proposed General Plan would not be adopted, and no further building would occur within the City of Loma Linda. This prohibition would compel any subsequent development to occur in surrounding cities and unincorporated areas of the County, resulting in any incremental growth in population, housing, or employment opportunities to occur in those areas. The No Project/No Build alternative represents a baseline against which the impacts of the proposed General Plan can be measured.
- **No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative.** Section 15126 (d)(4) of *CEQA Guidelines* states that the "No Project" alternative must discuss existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future under current existing plans. It is not reasonable to assume that no further development would take place in the Planning Area. Therefore, this alternative assumes build out under the existing City of Loma Linda General Plan.
- **Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative.** Under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, the City would continue to grow; however, development in the South Hills would be restricted to Estate Residential (0-1 du/ac). Residential densities would be increased in the areas outside the South Hills. Out of the 6,092.18-acre General Plan area, 64 percent is residential, 10 percent mixed-use, 8.7 percent conservation, 6 percent institutional/business park, 4 percent public/quasi-public uses, 4 percent commercial, 3 percent office/medical office, and 0.3 percent industrial. The Mixed-Use-designated area of 542.12 acres was assumed to include 20 percent residential, 10 percent commercial and 70 percent office. The intent of the alternative was to reduce impacts to the South Hills and to concentrate the residents closer to the employment centers. This alternative would also designate hillside areas for conservation.

- **Increased Residential Alternative.** The Increased Residential Alternative would eliminate the mixed-use category and redistribute the 899.04 acres of mixed-use under the proposed General Plan to low-density residential, business park, recreation, and conservation land use designations. Under this alternative 73 percent of the City would be designated for residential development, 10 percent for conservation, 6 percent for institutional/business park, 5 percent for public/quasi-public, 4 percent for commercial, and 2 percent for office/medical office. As with the Reduced Hillside Residential Alternative, this alternative would designate 10 percent of the City as conservation/open space.

4.1 No Project/No Build Alternative

Under No Project/No Build Alternative, public views and view corridors would not be impacted by grading or by the placement of new structures on previously developed land since no new development would occur. In addition, the additional development proposed by the proposed General Plan would not occur; therefore the existing visual quality would not degrade. No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan with respect to potential aesthetic impacts. Aesthetic impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, loss of open space and visual quality impacts are considered less than significant with this alternative.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, future development within the City and Sphere of Influence would not occur. There would, therefore, be no growth in population, housing, or employment opportunities. In the absence of population increases or the employment growth, air pollution emissions resulting from the project would not occur. Under this alternative, all of the air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, which remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation, would not occur.

Under this alternative, no development within the City would occur. There would be no direct disturbance of California gnatcatcher or San Bernardino kangaroo rat critical habitat within the City associated with future development. There would be no direct impact to riparian habitat; Federal or State listed, endangered, or threatened species; species of concern; or fragmentation of habitat or wild life corridors. The proposed General Plan would allow development within the South Hills. This area of the City contains sensitive habitat, and may contain sensitive plants, animals, and/or wildlife corridors. The No Project/No Build Alternative would not allow further development in the southern portion of the City, and, therefore, no direct disturbance of sensitive habitats.

The potential degradation or loss of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would not occur with this alternative since new development would not occur, and the urban area would not be expanded. The No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan with respect to cultural resources. However, with implementation of the policies and mitigation measures, development under the proposed General Plan is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

As no development would occur under this alternative, impacts such as an increase in the number of structures and people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with the rupture of a known earthquake fault or severe ground shaking would not occur. Build out of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in both population and new development. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan. However, after compliance with regulations, policies and associated implementation programs, all geologic and seismic impacts associated with the proposed General Plan are considered less than significant.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative no new development would occur; therefore, there would be no increase in the use, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials and the potential risk of exposure to these hazards would not increase. Build out of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in new development, which would lead to an increase in the potential exposure to hazardous materials. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan. After implementation of the proposed General Plan policies in conjunction with compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations hazardous materials impacts associated with both the No Project/No Build Alternative and the proposed General Plan are considered less than significant.

This Alternative would disallow future development within the City and sphere of influence. By prohibiting development within the City, additional growth in population, housing, or employment opportunities beyond those which presently exist would not occur. In the absence of population increases or the growth of employment-generating development, increases to the amount of water required to adequately service the City would not occur. Under this alternative, all local, State, and Federal policies and regulations pertaining to surface water and groundwater resources would remain in effect. Because no development would occur within the City, further alteration to or hydrologic interruption of surface and groundwater resources within City would not occur. Compared to the proposed project, water supply impacts associated with this alternative will be reduced.

By prohibiting development within the City, additional growth in population, housing, or employment opportunities beyond those which presently exist would not occur. In the absence of population increases or the growth of employment-generating development, additional increases in the amount land for development or the conversion of agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses over and above existing conditions would not occur. Under this alternative, all of the land use and agricultural associated with the proposed project would remain less than significant.

Because no development would occur within the City under this alternative, the number of persons or structures exposed to potential flood hazards would not increase. Currently, the City adheres to City, San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD), and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) programs and standards to reduce the significance of potential flood-control hazards. These programs and standards would remain in effect.

The proposed General Plan includes a number of includes policies and mitigation to reduce potential flood-related impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, a measure prohibiting the unmitigated development of structures within 100-year flood inundation areas has been identified. Because no development will occur, the number and of persons and structures within the City (compared to the proposed General Plan) is reduced under this alternative; therefore, potential flood-hazard impacts under this alternative are similarly reduced.

In the absence of population increases or the employment growth, noise impacts associated with new noise-generating sources or activities or location of new land uses next to existing noise-generating sources would not occur. Under this alternative, no noise impacts would occur.

Under this alternative, development of new residential units within the City of Loma Linda would not occur. Population growth within San Bernardino County would occur in the other cities or the unincorporated areas of the County. Because the development of housing, employment opportunities, or a corresponding population increase would not occur, conditions within the City would be similar to those which currently exist. However, under this alternative, the City would not be able to meet the existing and future housing needs of its residents as determined by SCAG, nor would the City be able to meet future housing obligations to provide a fair share of housing for all economic segments of the

community. This alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan with regard to population and housing.

By prohibiting development within the City, additional growth in population and of structures would not occur. In the absence of population increases or of new structures, the demand for fire and police services over and above existing conditions would not occur. Under this alternative, fire-related impacts would remain significant as the City currently is in need of second fire station to serve the South Hills area which is located in a Hazardous Fire Area, is distant from the existing headquarters station, and because of the existing increase in calls for service.

Under this alternative, no new development would occur; thus, no new students would be introduced into the school system other than children reaching school age from existing residences within the City of Loma Linda. Development would occur in areas outside the City within the boundaries of both the Redlands Unified School District and the Colton Joint Unified School District which, in compliance with State law, impose school mitigation fees that are collected at the time of development. Thus, while both school districts are operating at, or near capacity, as provided for by Government Code Section 65996(a) and (b) which specifies that the method of mitigating school facilities is to pay the maximum school fees, such fees are deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. Therefore, with no new development within the City and growth occurring outside of the City, the impacts to schools will be less than significant.

Existing library services are adequate to meet the needs of the community. With no new development and no change in the population, no additional library services would be added under this alternative. Therefore, the impacts to library services will be less than significant.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, expansion of or improvement to the existing public services and utilities would not occur. Existing wastewater services within the City are adequate in providing for the community; the City currently utilizes less than half of its assigned allotment for wastewater discharge. Increased demands upon existing wastewater services would not occur with this alternative since future development in the Planning Area would not occur. Therefore, implementation of this alternative with respect to wastewater services is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater services.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, expansion of or improvement to the existing public services and utilities related to solid waste would not occur. Existing solid waste services within the City are adequate in providing for the community. Increased demands upon existing solid waste disposal services would not occur with this alternative since future development in the Planning Area would not occur. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to solid waste disposal, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to solid waste services.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, expansion of or improvement to the existing public gas and electric utilities would not occur. Existing electricity and natural gas services within the City are adequate in providing for the community. Future development in the Planning Area would not occur, so an increased demand upon existing electricity and natural gas services would not occur with this alternative. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to electricity and natural gas services, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to electricity and natural gas services.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative there will be no additional vehicular traffic on area roadways because no additional construction would be allowed. This alternative would not have a cumulative effect on the freeway mainlines and interchanges. This alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan with regard to traffic generation.

In the absence of population increases, additional increases in the amount of land for recreational purposes over and above existing conditions would not occur. Under this alternative, all of the parks and recreational impacts would remain significant as the City currently does not have adequate parkland for the existing population.

Findings. In rejecting this alternative as infeasible and failing to meet project objectives, the City Council makes the following findings:

- The proposed General Plan provides for a comprehensive and updated plan with policies which are internally consistent and cover the City's entire sphere of influence. The City's sphere of influence could be built under the County of San Bernardino General Plan and zoning irrespective of what the City of Loma Linda desires for its sphere of influence.
- The proposed General Plan incorporates a Housing Program which conforms to State Law and is consistent with the remainder of the General Plan. The No Project/No Build alternative is not in compliance with State Law.
- The proposed General Plan is based on the most recent data available to the City and reflects the current policy of the City Council. The No Project/No Build would not allow the City Council to implement its current policies.
- The No Project/No Build alternative will not substantially reduce any remaining significant impacts associated with the proposed General Plan and will constrain the City's ability to achieve housing and economic objectives.

4.2 No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

The existing General Plan contains elements which were approved at various times from 1973 to 1993. The existing General Plan encompasses the same Planning Area as the proposed General Plan; however, a large portion of the Planning Area within the City limits has no land use designation and only a portion of the land area within the sphere of influence has a land use designation in the existing General Plan. Therefore, the analysis of this alternative assumed no development will occur on land where land use is not designated. Land Uses designated under the existing General Plan are provided in the Draft EIR Table 6.A.

Implementation of this alternative assumes that ultimate build out of the existing General Plan would occur. The existing General Plan anticipates that 43 percent of City will be built out with residential land uses, 14 percent with public uses, 7 percent with institutional and office uses, 6 percent industrial, and 5 percent commercial. Twenty-five percent of the City has no land use designation. Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, the City's population and jobs would increase consistent with development allowed under the existing General Plan and would be consistent with SCAG projections.

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan would result in 53,818 jobs and 13,921 dwelling units at build out compared to 26,167 jobs and 15,052 housing units at build out¹ of the proposed General Plan (refer to the Draft EIR Table 6.B). This difference is due to inclusion of residentially designated land uses in all the hillside areas and the sphere of influence. Additionally, the proposed General Plan has more mixed-use areas which permit residential uses at higher densities than the existing General Plan. These anticipated future conditions resulting from the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative are different from the analysis contained throughout Section 4.0 of the Draft EIR, which compares the proposed project to existing conditions as they were at the time the Notice of Preparation for the EIR was posted. Here, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative examines a future condition that is trended forward from today, on the basis of the earlier (but still operative) General Plan.

New development would occur throughout the City as permitted by the existing General Plan and subject to existing applicable design regulations. The existing General Plan provides less direction for new development and the General Plan policies are much less clear than the policies in the proposed General Plan. Therefore, impacts created by development design would be greater under this alternative because the existing General Plan does not provide as much direction as the proposed General Plan. However, impacts to view sheds created by hillside development would be less in this alternative as many of the hillside areas are designated for conservation or have no land use designation. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan as planned development would have better guidelines under the proposed General Plan while less development would occur in the view sheds under the existing General Plan.

Development as permitted under the existing General Plan would continue, thereby increasing population and employment-generating uses within the City. With such growth, a corresponding increase in air pollution emissions would occur. Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day to approximately 315,000 trips per day. This represents a slight increase in daily trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would produce approximately 287,817 trips per day.

Although air emissions from stationary sources also produce air emissions, the primary factor is the quantity of trips produced citywide. Consequently, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would produce similar impacts associated with air pollution emissions. However, air quality impacts under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable since the emissions would exceed AQMD thresholds and the emissions would be emitted into an air basin which is currently designated as "non-attainment" or worse for ozone and particulate matter, constituting a cumulative impact to air quality.

As with the proposed General Plan, the loss of natural lands due to projected growth would occur with this alternative and locations where sensitive plant and animal species are known and/or expected to occur would be impacted by new development. However, the existing General Plan does not include planned urban development of a large portion of the South Hills area. Therefore, less development would exist in the southern end of the City at build out. Because this area of the City would not have urban development planned, the loss of sensitive habitats would be less than what would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan.

¹ The General Plan build out numbers have changed since finalization of the EIR. They have been reduced. The EIR evaluated the worst case scenario for the number of residential units (17,261 dwelling units) and employment (27,564 employees).

The potential degradation or loss of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would occur with this alternative since the urban area would be expanded. However, the existing General Plan does not include land use designations for a large portion of the Planning Area within the City limits and for a portion of the land area within the sphere of influence. Therefore, less development would exist in these areas of the City at build out. Because these areas of the City would not have urban development, the loss of cultural resources would be less than what would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan with respect to cultural resources. However, with implementation of the General Plan policies and mitigation measures, development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

The proposed General Plan provides updated information regarding geology and soils within the Planning Area. However, due to the nature of geologic conditions, and the time scale at which they are measured, this information is largely unchanged from the existing General Plan. The existing General Plan does not include land use designations for a large portion of the Planning Area within the City limits and for a portion of the land area within the sphere of influence. Therefore, less development would exist in these areas of the City at build out. Because these areas of the City would not have urban development, this alternative's impacts relative to the exposure of structures and people to substantial adverse effects associated with faulting, severe ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, erosion, or expansive soils would be less than what would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan alternative, population and employment generating uses within the City would continue to grow. With an increase in population and employment generating uses, the potential for the increased use, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would occur. The potential risk of exposure to these hazardous materials would increase with increased development. A similar increase in population and employment generating uses would occur under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to hazardous materials, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. With implementation of policies in both the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan, along with compliance of with local, State, and Federal regulations hazardous materials impacts associated with the this alternative and the proposed General Plan are considered less than significant.

Development, as permitted under the existing General Plan would continue, thereby increasing population and employment-generating uses within the City. With such growth, a corresponding increase in the demand for water would occur. Under this alternative, build out of the City per the existing General Plan would increase the average daily water demand from 4.49 million gallons per day (mgd) to 8.80 mgd Table 6.D of the Draft EIR. The development of structures, facilities, and paved surfaces necessary to accommodate growth within the City may affect the volume, velocity, direction, or quality of stormwater runoff, which, in turn, may affect the quality and quantity of recharged water. Furthermore, the intensified utilization of groundwater and/or generation of wastewater flows may affect the quantity and quality of the groundwater basins from which the City withdraws its water supply.

While average day demand could be met by existing water resources, the maximum daily demand would exceed current water supplies. Although the magnitude of impact under this alternative would be reduced from that associated with the proposed General Plan, because an adequate source or supply of water has not yet been identified to satisfy the projected demand, water supply impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, land uses in Loma Linda would change consistent with the City's existing General Plan. The existing General Plan does not provide detailed policy direction for the hillside areas except to require Specific Plans and safe, consistent and complementary development. Land use density is only given for the Hillside Conservation area of the southern hills and much of the South Hills area is designated conservation or has no land use designation at all. Under State planning law all land areas must have an assigned use as well as density/intensity standards. Additionally, the existing General Plan has two land use sections making it difficult to determine the appropriate land uses that are designated. Implementation of this alternative would maintain existing conditions of land with no use designation which does not meet current planning law. In this regard, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan.

Compared to the proposed General Plan, the existing General Plan permits fewer residential units, but more non-residential development. Such growth would be expected to increase the number of persons exposed to potential flood hazards. Additionally, the construction of structures, facilities, and paved surfaces necessary to accommodate residential and non-residential development growth within the City may affect the volume, velocity, and/or direction of stormwater runoff, which, in turn, may affect the path, intensity, or volume of flood events.

Under this alternative, existing flood hazard mitigation programs implemented or administered by the City, SBCFCD, and/or FEMA would remain in effect. Under the existing General Plan, the City's build out population has been estimated at 31,740 persons (compared to 32,890 persons under the proposed General Plan). The increased amount of non-residential development permitted under the existing General Plan (31,914,000 square feet versus 22,029,808 square feet) and the number of jobs created (58,818 jobs versus 26,167 under the proposed General Plan) indicates that more persons would most probably be present in the City during a normal work day. Any decrease in the severity of flood hazards brought about by the reduced number of dwellings and decreased population under this alternative is substantially offset by the increase in the amount of non-residential development and the number of persons working within the City that may be exposed to potential flood hazards. Therefore, under this alternative, potential flood hazards to persons and property would be greater than those associated with the proposed General Plan.

Noise impacts associated with the introduction of sensitive land uses developing next to existing or future noise generators, such as the railroad line, would potentially be created under this alternative, as was identified for the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan policies and additional mitigation measures associated with such impacts would be needed to ensure that such impacts would be mitigated to less than significant. However, traffic noise levels under this alternative would be less than the proposed General Plan, due to the relative reduction in daily trip ends estimated for the alternative. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures for traffic noise impacts would render such impacts less than significant.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in approximately 13,225 households by 2025, fewer than what would be developed as part of the proposed General Plan (14,300 households). Population growth that would occur as part of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be consistent with existing population patterns in the City, and would not qualify as unanticipated population growth. Although development that would occur as part of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative could enable the City to meet its "fair share" housing allocation in the near term, the long-term construction of sufficient housing would be less likely under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative due to the lower number of housing units constructed at build out (compared to the proposed General Plan).

Under this alternative, fire-related impacts would remain significant as the City currently is in need of second fire station to serve the South Hills area which is located in a Hazardous Fire Area, is distant from the existing headquarters station, and because of the existing increase in calls for service.

At the present time, the City is able to provide adequate police services. However, as the population continues to grow there will be a need in the future to provide additional police personnel and potentially police facilities. Presently, the City averages a response to calls for services of 3.25 minutes. In the future, as the City grows as permitted under the existing General Plan, the Police Department will have to determine whether it can continue to provide adequate police services to maintain the established response times. Under this alternative, all of the police-related impacts would remain less than significant because the City's police provider is able to currently maintain an average 3.25-minute response time.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in approximately 13,225 households by 2025, fewer than what would be developed as part of the proposed General Plan. Population growth that would occur as part of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be consistent with existing population patterns in the City, and would not qualify as unanticipated population growth. Development would continue to occur resulting in new students being added to the school population. In compliance with State law, both the Redlands Unified School District and the Colton Joint Unified School District, which serve portions of the City, impose school mitigation fees that are collected at the time of development. Thus, while both school districts are operating at, or near capacity, and the school population will occur as new development occurs, as provided for by Government Code Section 65996(a) and (b) which specifies that the method of mitigating school facilities is to pay the maximum school fees, such fees are deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. Therefore, even with new development within the City as permitted by the existing General Plan, the impacts to schools will be less than significant.

At the present time, library services within the City are adequate to meet the needs of the community. The population of the Planning Area under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be less than the proposed General Plan; however, additional library services will be required with an increase in population. Impacts to library services would be less than significant under this alternative.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would permit development consistent with the existing General Plan, which would result in 53,818 jobs and 13,921 dwelling units at build out. The City of San Bernardino provides wastewater treatment services to Loma Linda as part of a Joint Powers Agreement. Presently, the City of Loma Linda utilizes less than half of its assigned allotment. Increased demands upon existing wastewater services caused by the addition of approximately 27,651 jobs in the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative are not expected to cause the City to reach its assigned allotment. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to wastewater services, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater services.

Development under this alternative would create more jobs and fewer residential units than the proposed General Plan. While decreases in the amount of solid waste will result from decreases in the number of residential units, the amount of solid waste generated by the increased number of jobs in the Planning Area would substantially increase the total amount of solid waste generated. Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a significant impact to solid waste services compared to the less than significant impact caused by the proposed General Plan. The City would need to continue its efforts to reduce the solid waste stream. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, development would occur throughout the City as permitted by the existing General Plan. At the present time, natural gas and electrical services are adequate to meet the needs of the Planning Area. However, as the population and the workforce continue to grow, there will be a need in the future to provide additional natural gas and electrical facilities. Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan, since both will require continued development of natural gas and electrical facilities to meet the needs of the growing population and workforce of the Planning Area. The impacts associated with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not significantly differ from the impacts associated with the proposed General Plan in regard to energy resources.

Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day (existing) to approximately 315,000 trips per day. This represents a slight increase in daily trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would produce approximately 263,672 trips per day. However, as with the proposed General Plan, the City of Loma Linda cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges will actually be completed, even if developments in Loma Linda provide fair share contributions. In addition, there are no mechanisms in place, nor are any contemplated to be available in the foreseeable future, that would provide for developer contributions to improvements along freeway mainlines. Thus, implementation of the Existing General Plan will not ensure mitigation for traffic along freeway mainlines, and a significant unavoidable impact will remain.

By allowing development consistent with this alternative within the City, additional growth in population would create a demand for increased parks and recreation opportunities. The City currently does not meet its goal of five acres of parkland for each 1,000 residents and new development would generally provide Park Development Impact Fees based on its own demand of parkland. Under this alternative, all of the parks and recreation impacts associated with this alternative would remain significant as the City currently does not have adequate parkland for the existing population.

Findings. In rejecting this alternative as infeasible and failing to meet project objectives, the City Council makes the following findings:

- The proposed General Plan provides for a comprehensive and updated plan with policies which are internally consistent and cover the City's entire sphere of influence. The current City's General Plan is internally inconsistent.
- The proposed General Plan incorporates a Housing Program which conforms to State Law and is consistent with the remainder of the General Plan. The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative is not in compliance with State Law.
- The proposed General Plan is based on the most recent data available to the City and reflects the current policy of the City Council. The No Project/ Existing General Plan would not allow the City Council to implement its current policies.
- The proposed General Plan will allow the City to upgrade its infrastructure systems providing new and improved services and facilities consistent with development policies that protect the hillsides and open space resources. Transportation corridors will be improved and traffic diverted away from neighborhoods maintaining the pedestrian-friendly quality of the community. The community's streets will be improved and maintained on a regular basis. Policies will be implemented that provide beautiful shaded, pedestrian-friendly streets with bike trails. New lighting throughout the City will improve the feeling of safety for local residents, and encourages evening strolls and visiting among neighbors.

- The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative would allow more residential building in the South Hills than with the proposed General Plan; therefore, affecting open space, the view shed and biological resources. This increased building in the hillsides will expose additional residents and structures to wildfire hazards.
- The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative will not substantially reduce any remaining significant impacts associated with the proposed General Plan and will constrain the City's ability to achieve housing and economic objectives.

4.3 Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative

Under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, aesthetic impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan, with the exception that the residential densities in the South Hills would be reduced. Development within the City would occur subject to applicable design regulations. With development at a reduced intensity, a reduction in light and glare impacts will result. In addition, scenic vistas and view corridors would be less impacted due to the reduction in hillside development. In regard to aesthetic impacts, this alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan.

Under this alternative, the number of residential units permitted to develop within the City and sphere of influence would be reduced by nearly 29 percent (15,052 dwelling units under the proposed General Plan versus 10,736 dwelling units under this alternative). Additionally, the amount of land devoted to commercial uses, business park, and office uses would increase approximately 61 percent (532.57 acres versus 335.63 acres). With the exception of recreation uses, the acreage devoted to other land uses would generally be reduced from the acreage cited for the proposed General Plan. With such growth, a corresponding increase in air pollution emissions would occur. Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day to approximately 255,809 trips per day. This represents a significant reduction in daily trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would produce approximately 263,672 trips per day.

Although air emissions from stationary sources also produce air emissions, the primary factor is the quantity of trips produced citywide. Consequently, the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would produce fewer impacts associated with air pollution emissions. However, air quality impacts under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable since the emissions would exceed AQMD thresholds and the emissions would be emitted into an air basin which is currently designated as "non-attainment" or worse for ozone and particulate matter, constituting a cumulative air quality impact.

This alternative would reduce the number and density of dwelling units in the South Hills area. Development on vacant property north of the South Hills area would occur as planned in the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan allows for clustering of development within the South Hills to avoid and protect native habitat and sensitive species. This alternative would reduce density in the hillsides; however, development of residences on 1-acre lots would be allowed. Development of 1-acre lots in the hillsides would have a greater impact on biological resources than the proposed General Plan. A greater number of acres of critical habitat will be disturbed or lost with this alternative than with the proposed General Plan. Wildlife corridors would be fragmented, residential development in the hillsides would introduce domestic animals (cats and dogs) that would adversely impact native wildlife.

Implementation of this alternative would not reduce the significant, unavoidable adverse impact on critical habitat and would have a greater impact on habitat fragmentation and possibly Federal and State endangered and threatened plant and wildlife species.

Potential degradation or loss of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would occur with this alternative since the urban area would be expanded in the same geographical area as the proposed General Plan. Since the protection of cultural resources would be provided, impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan. The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan with respect to cultural resources. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

When compared to the proposed General Plan, there would be a reduction in residential structures on the hillsides and the intensity of development would be less. However, the square footage of non-residential land uses is increased over that proposed by the General Plan. Thus, this alternative's impacts relative to the exposure of structures and people to substantial adverse effects associated with faulting, severe ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, erosion, or expansive soils, would be similar to the proposed General Plan.

When compared to the proposed General Plan, more employment-generating land uses would be developed under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative. The increase of employment-generating development would incrementally increase the use, generation, and transport of Hazardous Materials. The dumping of household hazardous materials would be expected to decrease due to both the reduced number of residential dwelling units under this alternative and due to the reduced amount of unimproved land under this Alternative. The reduction in the dumping of household hazardous materials is not likely to offset the increased use, generation, and transport of hazardous materials caused by the increase in employment-generating land uses. The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in regard to hazards and hazardous materials. Thus, this Alternative's impacts relative to hazards and hazardous materials would have a greater impact than the proposed General Plan.

Under this alternative, the number of residential units permitted to develop within the City and sphere of influence would be reduced by nearly 29 percent. Additionally, the amount of land devoted to commercial uses, business park, and office uses would increase approximately 61 percent (532.57 acres versus 335.63 acres). With the exception for recreation uses, the acreage devoted to other land uses would generally be reduced from the acreage cited for the proposed General Plan. Under this alternative, the average daily water demand would increase from 8.8 mgd to 11.057 mgd. The average daily demand for water under this alternative could be met from current well capacities. In the absence of any new supply capacity, the maximum daily demand would exceed the existing supply capacity. In light of this deficiency, water supply impacts associated with this alternative are significant and unavoidable.

Because an adequate source or supply of water has not yet been identified to satisfy the projected demand, the magnitude of impact on water supply under this alternative would increase from that associated with the proposed General Plan and water supply impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, land use impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan. The land use pattern would change as the number of dwelling units in the South Hills area would be reduced. Minimum parcel size in the area would be 1 du/ac and more land has been designated for conservation purposes. Additionally, the residential densities in the remaining areas would be increased and concentrated closer to the employment centers. The overall reduction of dwelling units proposed in the City under this alternative would be approximately 38 percent less than the proposed General Plan. The proposed reduction of dwelling units allowed in the hillside areas would be a positive benefit; in addition although an increase in residential densities in the remaining portions of the community will occur, the impacts will still be less than significant.

because residential development currently exists in these areas and services are generally available to serve the increase in the number of residents located near the City's employment centers. Policies have been included in the General Plan which ensure that new developments are compatible with existing neighborhoods and that the new development construct the necessary infrastructure and provide for open space or construct the recreational facilities in order to reduce the public costs for such uses. These policies will remain in effect under this alternative and will continue to exacerbate the housing-to-jobs balance within the City. Land use impacts will remain less than significant.

Under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, the City would continue to grow; however, development in South Hills would be restricted to one dwelling unit per acre, while residential densities in areas outside the South Hills would increase. The overall number of dwelling units and, correspondingly, the number of persons residing in the City under this alternative would be reduced from that associated with the proposed General Plan. The amount of non-residential development and the number of employment-generating uses would increase over that associated with the proposed General Plan.

The intent of this alternative is to restrict development in the South Hills and concentrate residents closer to employment centers. As much of the land designated for employment-generating uses is located within areas subject to an increased risk of flooding (northern portions of the City), this alternative would increase the number of residents, workers, and property exposed to flooding hazards. While the policies and measures identified in the proposed General Plan and General Plan EIR to mitigate potential flood hazards within the City would remain effect, compared to the proposed General Plan, there is an increased potential for significant flood-hazard impacts associated with this alternative.

Noise impacts associated with the introduction of sensitive land uses developing next to existing or future noise generators, such as the railroad line, would potentially be created under this alternative, as was identified for the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan policies and additional mitigation measures associated with such impacts would be needed to ensure that such impacts would be mitigated to less than significant. Traffic noise levels under this alternative would be less than the proposed General Plan, due to the relative reduction in daily trip ends estimated for the alternative. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures for traffic noise impacts would render such impacts less than significant.

The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would result in fewer dwelling units at build out compared to the proposed General Plan. The reduction in development that would occur as part of the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would make affordable housing more difficult to produce and may make it difficult for the City to meet its "fair share" housing allocation in the future. In regard to population and housing impacts, the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under this alternative would result in a significant impact on housing.

This alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units by nearly 29 percent primarily by reducing the number of units permitted in the South Hills area. Under this alternative, all of the fire-related impacts associated with the proposed project would remain non-significant because the policies contained in the General Plan include provisions to provide for an adequate number of fire stations, personnel, and equipment to protect the residents and businesses in the community as well as reviewing discretionary plans to ensure that the specified response time can be met. The reduction in development permitted in the hillside area recognizes the difficulty in providing fire services to the South Hills area by reducing the density in the area. The increase in density near the employment centers will continue to require fire services, but their location nearer the existing fire station will provide for acceptable response times and the overall calls for service will be reduced as the number

of residents structures will be less than those envisioned in the proposed General Plan. The current trend for fire services shows an average increase of approximately 5 percent which would be adequate in light of an overall reduction in residential dwelling units; therefore, under this alternative, the impacts to fire services would remain less than significant.

The number of minor and major crimes in the community has risen between 5 percent and 10 percent during the past five years. However, the reduction in development density especially in the South Hills area, which is located on the periphery of the community, will have a positive impact in reducing the need for police services in this portion of the community. Additionally, the increase in residential densities nearer the City's employment centers will not have an impact on police services because policies contained in the General Plan include provisions to provide for an adequate police force, to continue to strive to meet a 3.25-minute response to calls for services, increasing neighborhood watch programs, and utilizing defensible space techniques in new development. Therefore, under this alternative, police-related impacts would remain less than significant.

The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would result in fewer dwelling units at build out compared to the proposed General Plan. However, new development would continue to occur resulting in new students being added to the school population. Both the Redlands Unified School District and the Colton Joint Unified School District, which serve portions of the City, are operating at or near capacity. However, as permitted by State law, both Districts impose school mitigation fees that are collected at the time of development. Therefore, even though there will be a decrease in the number of students generated under this alternative, as provided for by Government Code Section 65996(a) and (b), the method of mitigating school facilities is to pay the maximum school fees, such fees are then deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. Therefore, even with new development occurring and the overall reduction in new students, the impacts to schools will continue to be less than significant.

The public services provided by libraries are based upon population numbers. Under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, the population would be much less than the proposed General Plan. The number of needed library facilities would also be less. Therefore, under the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, the impacts to library services will continue to be less than significant.

The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative reduces the number of dwelling units in the Planning Area. The population of the Planning Area would also be significantly reduced under this plan alternative. The City of San Bernardino provides wastewater treatment services to Loma Linda as part of a Joint Powers Agreement. Presently, the City of Loma Linda utilizes less than half of its assigned allotment. The demand for wastewater treatment services will be reduced greatly by the 29 percent decrease in the number of dwelling units. The increased demand caused by the addition of approximately 17,000 jobs in the Planning Area is not expected to cause the City to reach its assigned allotment. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to wastewater services, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater services.

With the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, fewer dwelling units would be developed. With fewer portions of the Planning Area designated as residential, jobs will increase significantly in the Planning Area. Even with a reduction in dwelling units, the level of solid waste generation will increase due to the higher number of jobs. The need for solid waste services and facilities will increase along with development. With this alternative, potential impacts to solid waste services would be greater than those associated with the proposed General Plan. The Reduced Hillside Density Alternative is environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan.

With the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative, development would occur throughout the Planning Area, but development in the South Hills area would be restricted to Estate Residential (0-1 du/ac). Residential densities would increase, but the total number of dwelling units would be reduced. With residential densities increased, the delivery of energy to residential areas will become more efficient. The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative may require continued growth of electrical and natural gas services, but it will require growth at a lesser extent than the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan.

Under this alternative, the number of residential units permitted to develop within the City and sphere of influence would be reduced by nearly 29 percent (15,052 dwelling units under the proposed General Plan versus 10,736 dwelling units under this alternative). Additionally, the amount of land devoted to commercial uses, business park, and office uses would increase approximately 61 percent (532.57 acres versus 335.63 acres). With the exception of recreation uses, the acreage devoted to other land uses would generally be reduced from the acreage cited for the proposed General Plan. Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day (existing) to approximately 255,809 trips per day. This represents a reduction in daily trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would produce approximately 263,672 trips per day. However, as with the proposed General Plan, the City of Loma Linda cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges will actually be completed, even if developments in Loma Linda provide fair share contributions. Thus, implementation of the Existing General Plan will not ensure mitigation for traffic along freeway mainlines, and a significant unavoidable impact will remain.

The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units by nearly 29 percent primarily by reducing the number of units permitted in the South Hills area. The reduction in density would decrease the demand for additional recreational land and facilities. In addition, because of the reduction in development permitted in the hillside areas, more land for both passive and active park uses would be available. The reduction in density in the hillside areas and the increase in residents nearer the employment centers will not alter or otherwise affect the policies in the General Plan regarding parks and recreation. This Alternative would continue to allow the City to retain its ability to collect Park Development Impact Fees as well as pursuing State Parks and Recreation and other grants, and pursuing joint use opportunities with the local school districts. As a result of reduction in residential density and the aforementioned policies, the impacts to parks under this alternative will remain less than significant.

Findings. In rejecting this alternative as infeasible and failing to meet project objectives, the City Council makes the following findings:

- The Reduced Hillside Density Alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units under the proposed General Plan by 29%. The City of Loma Linda is considered a "jobs rich" community as the number of jobs available in the City totaled 14,733 in 2000 (as determined by the 2001 RTP Growth Forecast) while the number of employed persons over the age of 16 living within the City totaled 8,679 (according to the 2000 Census). By reducing the number of dwelling units the City will continue to perpetuate the "jobs rich/housing poor" situation that currently exists.
- The Reduced Hillside Density Alternative would not guarantee public open space in conjunction with the reduced residences in the hillside. In addition, this alternative would not meet other objectives as outlined in the proposed General Plan.

4.4 Increased Residential Alternative

Under the Increased Residential Alternative, aesthetic impacts would be similar to the proposed General Plan, with the exception that there would be additional areas set aside for conservation in this alternative. Development within the hillside areas and throughout the City would occur subject to applicable design regulations. Development would continue to have light and glare impacts. Scenic vistas and view corridors would be slightly less impacted due to the increase in conservation areas. In regard to aesthetic impacts, this alternative is considered to have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Under this alternative, the number of residential units permitted within the City and sphere of influence would be increased by approximately 17 percent (from 15,052 dwelling units to 18,157 dwelling units). The amount of land devoted to commercial, business park, and office uses would total more than 199 acres more than that under the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, recreation and industrial uses would increase, while institutional and public facility uses would decrease. With such growth, a corresponding increase in air pollution emissions would occur. Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day to approximately 287,817 trips per day. This represents more daily trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would also produce approximately 263,672 trips per day.

Consequently, the Increased Residential Alternative would produce slightly more air quality impacts as the proposed General Plan. As was identified for the proposed General Plan, air quality impacts under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable since the emissions would exceed AQMD thresholds and the emissions would be emitted into an air basin which is currently designated as "non-attainment" or worse for ozone and particulate matter, constituting a cumulative air quality impact.

The same number of acres would be developed under this alternative as under the proposed General Plan. As with the proposed General Plan, this alternative would have an impact on sensitive plant and wildlife species, critical habitat, riparian habitat, and fragmentation of wildlife corridors.

Implementation of the policies and mitigation measures in the proposed General Plan will reduce impacts on biological resources to less than significant, with the exception of the loss of critical habitat. The Increased Residential Alternative will have the same impacts on biological resources as the proposed General Plan.

Potential degradation or loss of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would occur with this alternative since new development will occur. Future development will require the disturbance of vacant land potentially containing cultural resources. However, the area of physical disturbance of vacant land would be the same under this alternative as the proposed General Plan. The Increased Residential Alternative is considered to have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan with respect to cultural resources. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

Compared to the proposed General Plan, an increase of residential building areas and dwelling units would be developed under this alternative. Thus, this alternative's impacts relative to the exposure of structures and people to substantial adverse effects associated with faulting, severe ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, erosion, or expansive soils would be greater than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the Increased Residential Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

When compared to the proposed General Plan, more employment-generating land uses would be developed under the Increased Residential Alternative. The increase of employment-generating development would incrementally increase the use, generation, and transport of Hazardous Materials. The increase of residential units developed under this alternative would also incrementally increase the potential exposure to hazardous materials caused by the illegal dumping of household hazardous materials. The Increased Residential Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in regard to hazards and hazardous materials. This Alternative's impacts relative to hazards and hazardous materials would have a greater impact than the proposed General Plan.

The amount of land devoted to commercial, business park, and office uses would total more than 199 acres than that under the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, recreation and industrial uses would increase, while institutional and public facility uses would decrease. Under this alternative, the average daily water demand in the City at build out would be 17.622 mgd (35.245 mgd for maximum daily demand.)

The magnitude of impact under this alternative would exceed that associated with existing conditions, development per the existing General Plan, the proposed General Plan, and the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative. Because an adequate source or supply of water has not yet been identified to satisfy the projected demand, water supply impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

The amount of land devoted to commercial, business park, and office uses would total more than 199 acres than that under the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, recreation and industrial uses would increase, while institutional and public facility uses would decrease. The magnitude of impact under this alternative would exceed that associated with existing conditions, development per the existing General Plan, the proposed General Plan, and the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative. However, with the continued implementation of policies in the General Plan that require both commercial and industrial uses to be compatible with adjacent uses, buffered from residential uses, be pedestrian-friendly, utilize good siting techniques, etc., the impacts to land use and agricultural resources will remain less than significant.

The Increased Residential Alternative would eliminate the mixed-use land use classification from the proposed General Plan and, instead, allow the development of an increased amount of residential and non-residential development. Under this alternative, the number of residential units and residents would increase. Additionally, the amount of non-residential development and the number of jobs created within the City would increase.

Much of mixed-use land eliminated under this alternative is located within areas (northern portions of the City) more susceptible to flooding. While the policies and measures identified in the proposed General Plan and General Plan EIR to mitigate potential flood hazards within the City would remain effect, compared to the proposed General Plan, there is an increased potential for significant flood-hazard impacts associated with this alternative.

Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day to approximately 287,817 trips per day. This represents more daily trips as the proposed General Plan, which would also produce approximately 263,672 trips per day.

Noise impacts associated with the introduction of sensitive land uses developing next to existing or future noise generators, including railroad lines, would potentially be created under this alternative, as was identified for the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan policies and additional mitigation measures associated with such impacts would be needed to ensure that such impacts would be mitigated to less than significant. Traffic noise levels under this alternative would be the

same as under the proposed General Plan. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures for traffic noise impacts would render such impacts less than significant.

The Increased Residential Alternative would result in an increased number of dwelling units and an increased population at build out compared to the proposed General Plan. Development that would occur as part of the Increased Residential Alternative could enable the City to meet its "fair share" housing allocation due to the higher number of housing units constructed at build out (compared to the proposed General Plan). In regard to population and housing impacts, the Increased Residential Alternative is considered to have similar impacts on housing and population as the proposed General Plan.

Under the Increased Residential Alternative, the number of residential units permitted within the City and sphere of influence would be increased by approximately 17 percent (from 15,052 dwelling units to 18,157 dwelling units). The amount of land devoted to commercial, business park, and office uses would total more than 199 acres over that under the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, recreation and industrial uses would increase, while institutional and public facility uses would decrease. The magnitude of impact under this alternative would exceed that associated with existing conditions, development per the existing General Plan, the proposed General Plan, and the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative. However, with the continued implementation of policies in the General Plan that require both commercial and industrial uses to be compatible with adjacent uses, be buffered from residential uses, be pedestrian-friendly, utilize good siting techniques, etc., the impacts to fire services will remain less than significant.

As discussed above, the residential density and commercial, office and business park land uses within the City will be increased over those proposed in the General Plan. Most of the development will occur in the core of the community where not only are police services more generally available, but the location is in an area where more residents and visitors can provide additional surveillance. However, with the continued inclusion of policies contained in the General Plan which include provisions to provide for an adequate police force, to continue to strive to meet a 3.25-minute response to calls for services, increasing neighborhood watch programs, and utilizing defensible space techniques in new development, the impacts to police services will remain less than significant.

The Increased Residential Alternative would result in an increased number of dwelling units and an increased population at build out compared to the proposed General Plan resulting in new students being added to the school population. Both the Redlands Unified School District and the Colton Joint Unified School District, which serve portions of the City, are operating at or near capacity. However, as permitted by State law, both Districts impose school mitigation fees that are collected at the time of development. Therefore, even though there will be an increase in the number of students generated under this alternative, as provided for by Government Code Section 65996(a) and (b), the method of mitigating school facilities is to pay the maximum school fees, such fees are then deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. Therefore, even with new development occurring and the overall increase in new students, the impacts to schools will continue to be less than significant.

Under the Increased Residential Alternative, the population and number of dwelling units within the Planning Area at build out is increased. The Increased Residential Alternative will have a greater impact on library services than the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the Increased Residential Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

The number of residential units permitted within the Planning Area is increased by approximately 17 percent under the Increased Residential Alternative. The increase in total population is minimal in comparison to the proposed General Plan. The City of San Bernardino provides wastewater

treatment services to the City of Loma Linda. At build out of the proposed General Plan, the City of Loma Linda is still within its 7 mgd allotment. At build out of the Increased Residential Alternative, the City is not expected to exceed its allotment for wastewater treatment. Therefore, implementation of this alternative, with respect to wastewater services, is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan. Development under both this alternative and the proposed General Plan would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater services.

The impacts to solid waste under the Increased Residential Alternative would be greater at build out than those under the proposed General Plan. The number of housing units, people, and employment opportunities would be higher under the Increased Residential Alternative than under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the amount of solid waste generated would be higher. With the increase of solid waste generation, the services and facilities that dispose of the solid waste must also be increased. The increase in landfill capacity or the creation of a new landfill will cause greater impacts than those created by the proposed General Plan. With policies included in the proposed General Plan, solid waste impacts would be reduced to less than significant. The Increased Residential Alternative will have significant impact on solid waste services. Therefore, the Increased Residential Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

Build out of the City under the Increased Residential Alternative will result in an increase in total population, residential structures, non-residential structures, and workforce in the Planning Area. The demand for energy and the level of consumption will be greater than that of the proposed General Plan. Energy facilities will need to be constructed or expanded to accommodate this increased future energy demand. Implementation of the Increased Residential Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan, since both will require continued development of natural gas and electrical facilities to meet the needs of the growing population and work force of the Planning Area. The impacts associated with the Increased Residential Alternative would not significantly differ from the impacts associated with the proposed General Plan in regard to energy resources.

Under this alternative, the number of residential units permitted within the City and sphere of influence would be increased by approximately 17 percent (from 15,052 dwelling units to 18,157 dwelling units). The amount of land devoted to commercial, business park, and office uses would total more than 199 acres more than that under the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, recreation and industrial uses would increase, while institutional and public facility uses would decrease. Under this alternative, trip ends (productions and attractions) would increase from approximately 170,000 trips per day to approximately 287,817 trips per day. This represents the a greater number of trips in comparison to the proposed General Plan, which would also produce approximately 263,672 trips per day. This alternative would have the same impact on traffic as the proposed General Plan, which is significant and unavoidable.

The increase in total population with this alternative is minimal; therefore, the demand for additional recreational land and opportunities would also be minimal. The increase in residential density will not alter or otherwise affect the policies in the General Plan regarding parks and recreation and will continue to allow the City to retain its ability to collect Park Development Impact Fees as well as pursuing State Parks and Recreation and other grants and pursuing joint use opportunities with the local school districts. As a result of reduction in residential density, and the aforementioned policies the impacts to parks under this alternative will remain less than significant.

Findings. In rejecting this alternative as infeasible and failing to meet project objectives, the City Council makes the following findings:

- The Increased Residential Alternative will increase the number of residential units and population as compared to the proposed General Plan. This will increase the exposure of structures and people to substantial adverse effects associated with faulting, severe ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, slope instability, erosion, or expansive soils compared to the proposed General Plan.
- The Increased Residential Alternative will increase employment-generating land uses as compared to the proposed General Plan. This will incrementally increase the use, generation, and transport of hazardous materials and incrementally increase the potential exposure to hazardous materials caused by the illegal dumping of household hazardous materials in comparison to the proposed General Plan.
- The Increased Residential Alternative will increase the potential for significant flood hazard impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.
- The Increased Residential Alternative will increase the population as compared to the proposed General Plan, thereby increasing impacts on library services.
- The Increased Residential Alternative will increase the number of dwelling units, population, and employment opportunities as compared to the proposed General Plan resulting in increased solid waste generation. This will increase impacts to solid waste services. The increase in landfill capacity or the creation of a new landfill will cause greater impacts than those created by the proposed General Plan.

4.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project (CEQA Section 15126.6). If the environmentally superior alternative is determined to be the No Build Alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives, if the analysis indicates that significant impacts can be avoided by one or more alternatives. Following is a description and a comparative environmental evaluation of the impacts identified for the proposed General Plan and for each alternative.

Table 6.E in the Draft EIR (page 6-27) compares the potential impacts of the proposed General Plan with each of the alternatives. The proposed General Plan had significant unavoidable adverse impacts on aesthetics/visual resources (loss of open space), biological resources, air quality, water supply, and transportation. A side-by-side comparison of the issues as evaluated in the EIR is provided in Table 6.E of the Draft EIR for each of the General Plan alternatives. For example, for the No Project/Build Alternative, the impacts of loss of open space are less than the impacts of the proposed General Plan on aesthetics/visual resources.

The proposed General Plan will have significant unavoidable adverse impacts on the loss of open space, air quality, loss of critical habitat, availability of a long-term water supply, and traffic impacts to the mainline of I-10. All other effects of the proposed General Plan were reduced to less than significant through the implementation of General Plan policies or in a combination of policies and mitigation measures.

Of the four project alternatives evaluated, one would result in no physical changes to the environment on the General Plan Planning Area (No Project/No Build Alternative) and one would allow the development according to the density established in the existing General Plan (No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative). Relocating the proposed project to an alternative site is not feasible, as the

proposed General Plan covers the entire Loma Linda City limits and sphere of influence. Therefore, no alternative site was considered. As shown in Table 6.E in the Draft EIR, each of the four alternatives would result in a combination of similar, avoided or decreased, and increased environmental impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

The No Project/No Build Alternative would result in greater impacts to population and housing. Impacts under all other categories would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative is not feasible, as it fails to accommodate current and projected growth within the City, and has been rejected as environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater impacts related to design, land use and agricultural uses, flooding hazards, population and housing, fire protection, solid waste generation, transportation and circulation, and parks and recreation compared to the proposed General Plan. Impacts related to light and glare, short-term construction air quality, long-term regional air quality emissions, long-term stationary and railroad noise, cultural and paleontological resources, hazardous materials, water resources, police protection, wastewater, and gas and electric facilities and services would be the same as the proposed General Plan under this alternative. There would be less of an impact on visual resources, biological resources, and seismic hazards since more of the hillside area would remain in open space. Because of the decrease in housing and population with the existing General Plan, there would be less of an impact on schools and libraries and less of an effect on sensitive resources from construction and long-term vehicular traffic.

Impacts under the remaining two alternatives would be similar to the proposed General Plan with regard to community design, cultural resources, air quality impacts, construction and stationary noise, and wastewater generation.

The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would transfer the densities within the hillside and concentrate that development to the north of the hillsides but would also increase non-residential uses in the City and its sphere of influence. Thus, under this alternative, impacts to and from hazardous materials, exposure of structures to flooding hazards, an increase in jobs over housing, and an increase in solid waste generation would be greater than under the proposed General Plan. Average water demand (and the water supply impacts) under this alternative would be increased over that identified for the proposed General Plan. Additionally, because this alternative would permit a greater number of acres to be disturbed or lost in the South Hills (due to the development of residential uses on 1-acre lots), impacts on biological resources would be increased. Because of a decrease in residential units, there would be a decrease in transportation and circulation impacts and associated vehicular noise impacts with this alternative. Impacts related to loss of open space and aesthetics and visual resources would be reduced because there would be less building allowed in the hillsides. The need for public services and facilities and utilities would be less under this alternative with a decrease in population, with the exception of solid waste generated by an increase in non-residential land uses.

Transportation and circulation impacts associated with the Increased Residential Alternative would be greater than those anticipated for the proposed General Plan. This alternative would accommodate about three thousand more residential units and a population increase of approximately 5,000 than the proposed General Plan. Compared to the proposed General Plan, the increase residential units and other development would expose greater numbers of persons to natural and man-made disasters; as well as generate a higher demand on water, energy, library, recreation, and school providers.

Impacts related to; aesthetics and visual resources; light and glare; construction, stationary, long-term vehicular, and railroad noise; construction and long-term air quality; land use and agriculture;

population and housing; biological resources and cultural/paleontological resources; and police, fire, and wastewater would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan.

Findings. Overall, the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would result in similar or reduced impacts compared with the proposed General Plan (with the exception of land use impacts, population, fire protection, and solid waste). All other feasible alternatives would result in greater impacts or the similar impacts compared to the proposed General Plan. Thus, the Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Reduced Residential Hillside Density Alternative would also meet the objectives of the proposed General Plan, which are to maintain and conserve the unique natural assets (the hillsides) and small-town atmosphere of the community; provide a range of community design options in response to varied lifestyle choices; improve present traffic flow and provide easy and convenient access to all areas of the community; establish areas for high-tech industries to complement the existing medical institutions; expand local employment opportunities; and broaden choices of transportation systems.

5.0 FINDINGS OF THE LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN AND RELATED ACTIONS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

5.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the Loma Linda General Plan would increase development of urban uses resulting in the loss of open space and aesthetic resources. The existing and future public views will be altered. Increased residential densities, mixed-use developments, and business park developments may be incongruous with the City's existing character and visual qualities. In addition, new development within the General Plan study area would increase the effects of light and glare upon existing residential uses. In addition, the implementation of the General Plan would result in conversion of open space areas to urban land use.

Findings. While the City of Loma Linda has no officially designated scenic views or vistas, existing views and landforms within the planning area are an important element of the City as evidenced by the 1993 Hillside Preservation Initiative. The 1993 Hillside Preservation Initiative was passed in order to preserve significant natural hillside amenities. The General Plan Update policies recognize the importance of these views and their contribution to the image of Loma Linda and provide for protection of the City's natural landforms and scenic vistas. The implementation of the proposed General Plan policies with respect to impacts to views and unique landforms would be reduced to less than significant.

The General Plan policies set the design standards for new development which ensures compatibility with existing development. These design standards detail development guidelines for all types of uses to ensure that development does not impact adjacent uses. When implemented, these design policies would ensure that aesthetic impacts relating to design and existing community character would be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan recognizes the impact of light and glare on sensitive receptors and sets standards for the screening and the location of new lighting sources to protect these sensitive receptors. Future development projects will be required to take part in site development review on a site-specific basis to ensure compliance with light and glare standards. Therefore, the proposed policies along with project-specific design review by the City will reduce lighting and glare impacts to a less than significant level.

While the proposed General Plan policies address the aesthetic impacts of new development, no mitigation is available to address the conversion of open space to urban land uses. This impact is significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Findings. Build out of the proposed General Plan would result in a substantial increase in urban uses throughout the Planning Area. The new development could alter surrounding visual resources through increased densities and intensities. Any new development that may cause destruction of natural resources and open space areas, including potential grading and construction activity without attention to natural slope contours or preservation of biological resources, would degrade visual quality. However, the development of structures and facilities would occur on vacant parcels and would be consistent with the policies outlined in the proposed General Plan (Policies 2.2.3.1.c, 2.2.3.1.j, 2.2.3.1.m, 2.2.3.1.q, 9.2.9.1, 9.2.9.1.a, 9.2.9.1.e, 3.1.9.2, 3.1.9.2.a-d, 3.1.9.2.h, 3.1.9.1.i). Specifically, the General Plan states in Policy 2.2.3.1.m that new development shall be located so as to maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources. Also General Plan Policy 3.1.9.1.a states that dwellings and other structures shall be designed to best fit with the hillside's contours, to correlate with the form of the terrain, and to limit visibility of the structure from the Loma Linda valley floor to the greatest extent feasible. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies would reduce the impacts on views and unique landforms to less than significant.

Many of the structures located within the City, including the multiple historic structures, contribute to the City's sense of character. The proposed General Plan allows for more development in all land uses, including business park, commercial, and residential. The visual quality of older neighborhoods could be degraded by the introduction of new development that does not respect the architectural styles and massing of existing structures. However, the proposed General Plan policies address the City's architectural styles and massing of existing structures in General Plan Policies 2.2.5.4.b., 3.1.6.1., 3.1.6.1.a-c., 3.1.6.1.e-i., 3.1.7.1, 3.1.7.1.c., 3.1.7.1.f., 3.1.8.1., 3.1.8.1.d., 3.1.9.1., 3.1.9.1.i. Specifically, Policy 3.1.9.1.i states that where residential infill development is proposed, ensure that the scale and massing of dwellings as well as the architectural character of new development is compatible with the existing residential neighborhood. In addition, an evaluation of potential impacts of development with respect to the view sheds within the City will be conducted on a project-by-project basis. With the aforementioned design policies and the review conducted on a project-by-project basis, the aesthetic impacts relating to design and existing community character would be less than significant.

Light and glare would be created by development with the implementation of the proposed General Plan. The most significant impacts would occur from new development occurring adjacent to undeveloped land as well as the development of commercial, industrial, and public facility uses adjacent to residential areas. However, the General Plan Update includes policies which address light and glare (Policies 2.2.5.4.a, 3.1.7.1.c, 3.1.1.1.q, and 3.1.9.2.m) and set the standards for screening of new lighting sources. Specifically, General Plan Policy 3.1.7.1.c states that new development shall avoid impacts to adjacent sensitive uses (e.g., residences, hospitals) through proper design that limits effects from noise and glare (i.e., through site layout building orientation, circulation/parking layout, noise attenuation, landscape buffering, and lighting design/location). In addition, future development projects will be required to take part in site development review on a site-specific basis to ensure compliance with light and glare standards. With the proposed General Plan policies and required site-specific review, the impacts of light and glare will be reduced to less than significant.

The City currently contains approximately 2,450 acres of open space and undeveloped parcels in the hillsides. The conversion of open space to urban uses would contribute to the loss of visual character as well as loss of open space in the City. The proposed General Plan contains many policies that address development in open space areas (Policies 2.2.3.1.c, 2.2.3.1.j, 2.2.3.1.m, 2.2.3.1.q,

3.1.9.2.d, 9.2.9.2, and 9.2.9.2.a-i). However, there are currently no policies available to address the conversion of open space to urban land uses. It is further found that there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could be adopted at this time which would reduce this impact of the loss of open space to a less than significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to a less than significant level, it is found that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts. For additional discussion regarding the project's impacts to open space and aesthetics, see Draft EIR, Section 4.2.

5.2 Air Quality

Potential Impacts. Air quality impacts would occur during construction-related activities associated with individual projects including grading and equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation during construction by vehicles and equipment. Fugitive dust is generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling. Blowing dust is also of concern in dry weather conditions where PM_{10} standards are exceeded by soil disturbance during grading and vehicular travel over unpaved roads.

Development associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in an overall increase in mobile source emissions within the City which may exceed SCAQMD Air Quality Standards. Long-term air emission impacts will occur from stationary sources related to the estimated development proposed through implementation of the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could conflict or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) or the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

Findings. During construction of the projects permitted under the proposed General Plan, generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) will occur. As opposed to an individual project with project-specific construction information available for emissions estimate, it is not feasible to accurately quantify the proposed General Plan related construction emissions because these air quality construction impacts would be a result of a number of different development projects that might occur at any given time throughout the City. The City will require individual development projects to comply with all applicable regional rules, which would assist in reducing the short-term air pollutant emissions. Fugitive dust from a construction site must be controlled with best available control measures so that the dust generated does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. Dust suppression techniques will be implemented to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM_{10} component) by 50 percent or more. The City will require all projects to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Compliance with these rules would reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. However, citywide construction emissions would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of the proposed General Plan and all feasible mitigation measures.

Although not specifically identified with land uses and their corresponding vehicular trips, mobile source emissions from vehicle use associated with the proposed General Plan can be estimated from VMT at the particular average speed projected within the project study area. Table 4.3.H in the General Plan Draft EIR presents emissions of CO, ROC, NO_x , and PM_{10} for the build out of the proposed General Plan. As shown in this table, implementation of the proposed General Plan would

generate CO and NOx emissions that would exceed the thresholds established by the SCAQMD. The rate of increase in VMT and annual growth percentages resulting from the implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in significant impacts. Implementation of the policies provided in the proposed General Plan will reduce the projected long-term increase in air pollutants. However, significant unavoidable impacts to long-term air pollutants would remain despite the implementation of the proposed policies.

Stationary pollution sources are generally divided into two subcategories: "point sources" (such as power plants and refinery boilers) and "area sources" (including small emission sources such as residential water heaters and architectural coatings). Medical facilities and residences are generally the main stationary pollution sources in Loma Linda, though most urbanized land areas and their associated activities also contribute to poor air quality in the region. The proposed General Plan contains one policy related to stationary sources. In addition, mitigation measures were added in the Draft EIR to ensure that stationary air quality impacts for residential, commercial, and institutional, and industrial would be reduced to less than significant.

An analysis was conducted of the consistency of the proposed Loma Linda General Plan with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (SCAQMP). The analysis concluded that the General Plan would not conflict or obstruct the SCAQMP. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the implementation of the General Plan would have a less than significant impact on the SCAQMP.

Facts in Support of Findings. The proposed General Plan includes the City and its sphere of influence. The impacts of build out of the proposed General Plan are actually a summary of the individual actions and development permits that will be undertaken throughout the Loma Linda Planning Area as opposed to an individual project with project-specific construction information occurring in a single location. PM₁₀ emitted during construction can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the equipment being operated, local soils, weather conditions, and other factors, making quantification difficult. Despite this variability in emissions, experience has shown that there are a number of feasible control measures that can be reasonably implemented to significantly reduce PM₁₀ emissions from construction. Because of the lack of proposed General Plan policies relating directly to construction activity and its emissions, the proposed General Plan does not mitigate construction-related impacts on air quality. Therefore, mitigation was proposed in the EIR to reduce the effects of blowing dust during grading and construction vehicle emissions (Mitigation Measures 4.3.4.1A, 4.3.4.1B, and 4.3.4.1C). The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 4.3.4.1B requires the implementation of dust suppression measures in the SCAQMD CEQA *Air Quality Handbook* while Mitigation Measure 4.3.4.1A adds applicable SCAQMD Rule 403 measures. Compliance with the recommended Mitigation Measures would reduce the impacts; however, citywide construction emissions would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of the General Plan and all feasible mitigation measures. It was found that there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could be adopted at this time which would reduce this impact of fugitive dust emissions to a less than significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to a less than significant level, it is found that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts. For additional discussion regarding the project's impacts to particulate emissions, see Draft EIR, Section 4.3. Long-term air emission impacts are associated with mobile sources involving any growth-related change. The proposed General Plan would result in mobile source increases. It is anticipated that the total new vehicular trips and associated VMT of the General Plan would result in criteria pollutant emissions to exceed the daily emissions thresholds established by the SCAQMD in its *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. The proposed General Plan policies related to air quality (Policies 2.2.5.1.b,

2.2.5.2.d, 2.2.5.3.b, 2.2.7.3, 2.2.7.3.a, 2.2.7.3.c, 2.2.8.1.c-d, 2.2.8.2.e, 2.2.8.3.a, 2.2.8.3.c, 2.2.8.4.a, 2.2.8.4.h-i, 2.2.8.4.n, 3.1.9.1.c, 4.6.2.b, 4.6.2.j, 4.6.2.k, 9.3.6, 9.3.6.a-c, 6.10.1.b-d, 6.10.1.l-m, 6.10.2.a-g, and 6.10.3.a-d) would generally result in better planning and projects that proactively address any adverse air quality impacts that could result. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies related to air quality would help reduce air pollutant emissions and improve the air quality by encouraging pedestrian-oriented land uses. Specifically General Plan Policy 6.10.2.g requires the site design in non-residential areas to be oriented to allow for safe and convenient pedestrian access from sidewalks, transit and bus stops, and other pedestrian facilities, in addition to access through required parking facilities. General Plan Policy 6.10.3.a requires the City to ensure that the site design of new developments provide for pedestrian access to existing and future transit routes and transit centers through specific review during the development process. Implementation of the policies provided in the proposed General Plan will reduce the projected long-term increase in air pollutants; however, significant impacts would remain. This impact is significant and unavoidable, and as the policies represent the best available mitigation measures, no further feasible mitigation measures are provided. It is found that there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could be adopted at this time which would reduce this impact of projected long-term increase in air pollutants to a less than significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to a less than significant level, it is found that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts. For additional discussion regarding the project's impacts to projected long-term air pollutants, see Draft EIR, Section 4.3.

Because of the characteristics of the proposed project, i.e., a General Plan, it is not possible to determine the location, size, and characteristics of future stationary pollution sources. It is, therefore, not feasible to quantify the proposed General Plan-related stationary sources emissions associated with the usage of electricity and natural gas. Similarly, the quantification of mitigation measures on emissions associated with these stationary sources is not feasible at a General Plan program level review. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policy (Policy 9.3.6.d) related to stationary sources would help reduce air pollutant emissions and improve the air quality. Mitigation measures 4.3.4.3.A-F were required to ensure that stationary impacts on air quality would be reduced to less than significant. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 4.3.4.3.D requires residential building construction to comply with energy use guidelines detailed in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. Mitigation Measure 4.3.4.3.E requires stationary air pollution sources to comply with applicable air district rules and control measures. Therefore, with the proposed General Plan policy and additional mitigation measures, the impacts of stationary pollution will be reduced to less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan is anticipated to direct growth within the City and result in an increase in population and VMT. As shown in Section 4.12, Population and Housing, actual population in the City in year 2000 was 2,839 people below the year 2000 SCAG population projection. In addition, the projected population, housing, and employment levels upon build out of the proposed General Plan are less than the SCAG projections for the year 2025. The increase in population and VMT within the city would not exceed the projections included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Air Quality Management Plan for the City of Loma Linda. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and Draft EIR mitigation measures identified in the prior air quality discussions would help reduce emissions of criteria pollutants associated with mobile and stationary sources. Therefore, the implementation of proposed General Plan policies pertaining to the reduction of mobile emissions would not conflict with nor obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and RCP.

5.3 Biological Resources

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would have an adverse impact on listed, proposed, or candidate species or the loss of habitat occupied by such species. Future development consistent with the proposed General Plan would cause direct loss of sensitive or critical habitat or cause habitat fragmentation resulting in isolation of sensitive habitat patches which are of limited biological value. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would also cause fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement. Additionally, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the direct loss of oak trees. Finally, implementation of the General Plan could affect the proposed Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

Findings. Thus, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the direct mortality of listed, proposed, or candidate species or loss of habitat occupied by such species. In addition, critical habitat for the California gnatcatcher has been identified within the City. Development within areas designated as critical habitat has the potential to fragment habitat and to lose habitat all together. The proposed General Plan policies focus primarily on avoidance, preservation and minimization of impacts to biological resources and habitats. The policies do not specify a method of identifying habitats that warrant such measures or the parameters to be used if avoidance or preservation are infeasible. Therefore, mitigation measures were added in the Draft EIR to address the identification and loss of habitats. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measures, impacts related to the loss of candidate or listed species would be less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the direct loss of 1,437.5 acres of sensitive habitat. The California Department of Fish and Game tracks the occurrence of natural communities which it considers to be the most sensitive in the state. As conditions change over time, conservation efforts may lead to habitat types being added to or removed from the set of habitats considered sensitive. Construction of proposed General Plan land uses may result in the loss or fragmentation of sensitive habitat(s). As land use proceeds under implementation of the proposed General Plan, patches of habitat on undeveloped properties will initially be fragmented by the sporadic pattern of development. However, once the proposed General Plan reaches build out, the only fragmented patches remaining would be those set aside within a project site as on-site mitigation or due to development constraints (e.g., steep slopes), or both. Thus, the initial fragmentation of undeveloped properties would be an interim condition with the long-term fragmentation occurring under total build out. Regional fragmentation will occur as existing biological reserves and other conservation lands (e.g., San Timoteo Canyon State Park) become surrounded and isolated by community and rural development. The proposed General Plan will create habitat fragmentation resulting in isolation of sensitive habitat patches creating a "checkerboard" pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value. Even with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the cumulative loss and fragmentation of critical coastal California gnatcatcher habitat will remain significant and unavoidable.

As land use development proceeds under the proposed General Plan, wildlife movement will be increasingly inhibited until build out of the proposed General Plan results in the exclusion of wildlife from large areas and the associated elimination of wildlife movement. Thus, the initial interruption of wildlife movement between undeveloped properties would be only an interim condition with the long-term elimination of wildlife movement occurring under total build out. The proposed General Plan will result in fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement. The General Plan policies do not fully mitigate the impacts to wildlife movement. In conjunction with the proposed General Plan policies, mitigation measures were added in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the

proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measures, the impact to wildlife corridors would be reduced to less than significant.

Oak trees are dependent upon site conditions and a variety of associated natural processes for their growth, survival, and reproduction. Natural processes and conditions upon which the trees depend include, but are not limited to, the hydrologic regime, soil structure and chemistry, and microclimate. The only oak trees in the Planning Area are confined to a small area adjacent to existing farming uses. Construction of the proposed General Plan land uses may result in the direct loss of these oak trees or may result in the alteration of natural processes upon which the trees depend. The proposed General Plan policies focus on preservation of the oak woodland area. As the oak woodland area is isolated and not considered of importance biologically, the policies would fully mitigate the impacts of development and impacts to oak trees would be less than significant.

Riverside County has adopted its Western Riverside County MSHCP. The San Bernardino County MSHCP was in the planning process at the time the EIR was written but the County Board of Supervisors has decided not to pursue an MSHCP. The County of Riverside has designated areas to be considered for preservation adjacent to the Loma Linda City limits. One of the areas under consideration for preservation in the Riverside MSHCP is adjacent to the southern hills area of Planning. However, the City of Loma Linda has shown through proposed General Plan policies its willingness to participate in such plans, should they be created. The implementation of the proposed General Plan will have a less than significant impact on Conservation Plans.

Facts in Support of Findings. According to the Draft EIR on page 4.4-14, a total of 24 species which are listed, proposed, or candidates for listing under the California and/or the Federal Endangered Species Act were identified as potentially present within the Planning Area. Moderate to low suitable habitat was present for two listed species: thread-leaved brodiaea and slender-horned spinyflower. An additional 35 non-listed sensitive species are considered potentially present in the Planning Area with 17 of those species considered to have a moderate to high potential. Every potential habitat type identified will be impacted to at least some degree by implementation of the proposed General Plan. The General Plan policies (Policies 2.2.3.1.c, 2.2.3.1.g, 2.2.3.1.m, 3.1.9.2, 3.1.9.2.d, 9.2.9.2, 9.2.9.2.a, 9.4.4, 9.4.4.a-b., and 9.4.4.d-e) focus primarily on avoidance, preservation and minimization of impacts to biological resources and habitats. Specifically, General Plan Policy 2.2.3.1.m requires developers to site new development so as to maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources. General Plan Policy 9.4.4.b requires appropriate setbacks adjacent to natural streams to provide adequate buffer areas ensuring the protection of biological resources. The Draft EIR included mitigation measures to identify biological resources and establish parameters for methods other than avoidance and preservation. Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.1A requires the preparation of biological reports in compliance with standards established by the City of Loma Linda for development related to uses that require discretionary approval to assess the impacts of such development and provide mitigation for impacts to biological resources. In Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.1B, the City established a baseline ratio for preserving habitat at a minimum of 1:1 replacement ratio in locations that provide long-term conservation value for impacted resources. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The implementation of proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measures identified above will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Habitat fragmentation occurs when a proposed action results in a single, unified habitat area being divided into two or more parts, such that the division isolates the two new areas from each other. Isolation of habitats occurs when wildlife cannot move freely from one portion of the habitat to another or from one habitat type to another. An example is the fragmentation of habitats within and around "leapfrog" patterns of residential development. Habitat fragmentation can also occur when a portion of

one or more habitats is converted into another habitat, as when scrub habitats are converted into annual grassland habitat because of frequent burning. The result of fragmentation is that the amount of habitat available to local wildlife populations is reduced. In general, a reduction in available habitat is followed by a reduction in wildlife populations because the remaining areas are too small to support pre-fragmentation population levels. Determining if the impact is significant at the level of site-specific projects that are proposed in accordance with the proposed General Plan land uses will require analysis as part of the subsequent evaluation of such projects. The potential for such impacts to be considered significant will depend upon various factors including, but not limited to, the site conditions at the time of project evaluation, the extent of the area potentially affected, the quality of the habitat being affected, and the value of the affected habitat at local and regional scales. The proposed General Plan policies (Policies 9.2.9.2, 9.2.9.2.a-e) focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of native vegetation. The policies provide for avoidance and minimization of impacts to some sensitive habitats but do not specify a means for identifying habitats that warrant such measures. Specifically proposed General Plan Policy 9.2.9.2 states that the City should acquire, preserve and maintain open space and its natural resources for future generation. In addition the proposed General Plan policies do not specify parameters for compensating for the loss of habitats when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The Draft EIR specifies the implement Mitigation Measures 4.4.4.1A and 4.4.4.1B, mentioned above, along with Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.2A, which requires construction of treatment wetlands outside of natural wetlands, allowing treatment of runoff from developed surfaces prior to entering natural stream systems. The Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. Even with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the cumulative loss and fragmentation of critical coastal California gnatcatcher habitat will remain significant and unavoidable. It is found that there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could be adopted at this time which would reduce this impact of the loss of critical coastal California gnatcatcher habitat to a less than significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to a less than significant level, it is found that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts. For additional discussion regarding the project's impacts to biological resources and the critical habitat of the California gnatcatcher, see Draft EIR, Section 4.4.

As stated in the Draft EIR on page 4.4-19, as land use development proceeds under the proposed General Plan, wildlife movement will be increasingly inhibited until build out of the proposed General Plan results in the exclusion of wildlife from large areas and the associated elimination of wildlife movement. Thus, the initial interruption of wildlife movement between undeveloped properties would be only an interim condition with the long-term elimination of wildlife movement occurring under total build out. The proposed General Plan will result in fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement. The proposed General Plan policies (Policies 3.1.9.2.b, 3.1.9.2.d-f, 3.1.9.2.i, 9.2.9.2, 9.2.9.2.a-e, 9.4.4, 9.4.4.e) focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to wildlife corridors. Specifically, General Plan Policy 9.4.4.e states the City, through development review, will retain as feasible, wildlife corridors in the Planning Area in particular, the San Timoteo Wash area. Furthermore, the policies do not specify a means for identifying specific sites (either locally or regionally) that warrant such measures. Nor do the policies specify parameters for compensating for loss of wildlife movement when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. The policies do not fully mitigate the impacts to wildlife movement. The Draft EIR proposed the following mitigation measures to ensure the preservation of wildlife corridors: Mitigation Measures 4.4.4.3A-C. One of the aforementioned measures, Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.3A, requires developers with new development in the hillside areas to prepare a biological report which includes identifying local and regional habitat patterns that provide movement routes for wildlife or where opportunities exist to establish movement routes between isolated habitat patches. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. With implementation of the proposed

General Plan policies and the mitigation measures, the impact to wildlife corridors would be reduced to less than significant.

Oak trees are dependent upon site conditions and a variety of associated natural processes for their growth, survival, and reproduction. Natural processes and conditions upon which the trees depend include, but are not limited to, the hydrologic regime, soil structure and chemistry, and microclimate. The trees in the City of Loma Linda are not considered to be of biological value as they are isolated woodland. However, the trees have intrinsic value to the City as they are the only oak trees remaining within the Planning Area. The proposed General Plan contains two policies pertaining to oak trees. General Plan Policy 9.2.9.1.a requires the City to preserve outstanding natural features, such as the skyline of a prominent hill, rock outcroppings, and native and/or historically significant trees. Also, General Plan Policy 9.4.4.c requires the City to preserve, as feasible, the oak woodland areas within the City by requiring development to incorporate the trees into the development design. The proposed General Plan policies focus on preservation of the oak woodland area. As the oak woodland area is isolated and not considered of importance biologically, the policies would fully mitigate the impacts of development and therefore, implementation of the proposed General Plan would have a less than significant impact on the loss of oak trees.

Riverside County has adopted its Western Riverside County MSHCP. The San Bernardino County MSHCP has been discontinued. The County of Riverside has designated areas to be considered for preservation adjacent to the Loma Linda City limits. One of the areas under consideration for preservation in the Riverside MSHCP is adjacent to the southern hills area of Planning Area. Even though the County in which the City of Loma Linda is located has not established specific conservation areas, the City recognizes the need to establish and participate in such conservation plans as evidenced by the General Plan Policies 9.2.9.2, 9.2.9.2.a-e. Specifically, General Plan Policy 9.2.9.2.d requires the City to coordinate through development review which includes coordinating with Loma Linda's open space system in conjunction with adjacent cities, San Bernardino County, the State, and regional and private open space systems in order to connect the systems and share resources. The policies are directed toward preserving open space and thereby creating areas for habitat conservation. The implementation of the proposed General Plan will have a less than significant impact on Conservation Plans.

5.4 Cultural Resources

Potential Impacts. As determined in the Draft EIR on page 4.5-11 development within currently vacant unincorporated areas of the City will result in an increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands. Therefore, development as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan could potentially directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. In addition, development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could have the potential to disturb buried archaeological resources and buried human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could also cause the destruction of or loss of an historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.

Findings. Geological mapping of the Loma Linda area indicates the presence of four sedimentary units with two of the sedimentary units having a high potential for paleontological resources. The proposed General Plan would allow development of structures within areas that contain high sensitivity for paleontological resources. The proposed General Plan includes a policy that requires, as a standard condition of development, that if paleontological resources are encountered during site grading that grading is to be halted until a qualified paleontologist evaluates and records the find. The proposed General Plan recognizes the importance of paleontological resources. However, the

proposed General Plan lacks any provision that address a recovery program. Without this policy in place, the impact to paleontological resources would be significant. However, the Draft EIR proposed Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.1A and with adherence and the implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

Due to the relatively small percentage of the Planning Area which has been surveyed for prehistoric resources (approximately 30%), pending a cultural resources survey of the balance, the majority of the Planning Area should generally be considered moderately sensitive for the presence of prehistoric resources. The exceptions include the area in the vicinity of the Guachama Rancheria, (Mission Avenue and Pepper Way), which may contain buried prehistoric resources and should be considered highly sensitive. In addition, all other built up areas located within the City should be considered moderate to low sensitivity for prehistoric resources due to the existing development of the sites. The policies within the proposed General Plan require cultural resources surveys to be conducted prior to development occurring on a site-specific basis. A cultural resources survey, which includes a records search¹, can identify the existence of above-surface human remains, archaeological and historic resources along with the likelihood for buried cultural resources including human remains. In conjunction with the proposed General Plan policies, mitigation measures were proposed in the Draft EIR that would reduce the impact to impacts to archaeological resources and disturbance to buried human remains to less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan may disturb or destroy existing historic structures and resources through the construction of new residential, commercial, institutional or industrial buildings, and/or new infrastructure such as roadways and utilities. The City of Loma Linda has had a long-term interest in historical preservation as evidenced by an architectural/historical inventory of existing structures completed fourteen years ago and the inclusion of an historic preservation chapter in the zoning code. With new development required to adhere to proposed General Plan policies and the focus on preservation of existing historical structures, future development in the City will have a less than significant impact on historical structures or resources.

Facts in Support of Findings. Significant paleontological resources are fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, diagnostically or stratigraphically important. This includes fossils that add to an existing body of knowledge in specific areas, stratigraphically, taxonomically, or regionally. The City also considers fossil remains of large to very small aquatic and terrestrial vertebrates, remains of plants and animals previously not represented in certain portions of the stratigraphy, and assemblages of fossils that might aid stratigraphic correlations, particularly those offering data for the interpretation of tectonic events, geomorphologic evolution, paleoclimatology, and the relationships of aquatic and terrestrial species as significant paleontological resources. The proposed General Plan contains Policy 9.7.5.f which requires that if paleontological resources are encountered during site grading that grading is to be halted until a qualified paleontologist evaluates and record the find. The concept of reducing impacts to levels below significant involves removal of nonrenewable paleontological resources from the field of excavation as they are exposed and, if possible, prior to damage by excavation. Although not all fossils present will be recovered by the program of excavation monitoring and salvage, it is important to recover a significant fossil assemblage that would not have been recovered if the monitoring and recovery program had not been in place. Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.1A proposed in the Draft EIR states that when existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain paleontological resources, a paleontologist shall monitor site grading activities with the authority to halt grading to

¹ A records search is a formal request made by a qualified archaeologist to an archaeological repository, such as the San Bernardino County Museum in Redlands, to provide a written account of all previous recorded surveys within one square mile of a project site.

collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate reposition, and file a report with the City Planning Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during site grading. The Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. With adherence to the proposed General Plan policy and implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

As determined in the Draft EIR on page 4.5-12, although only one ethnohistoric and three historic archaeological sites have been recorded within the Planning Area (CA-SBR-2311/H, CA-SBR-647H, CA-SBR-6137H, and CA-SBR-6169H), the historic cultural landscape of Loma Linda is complex. With such a complex historical and cultural landscape located within the Planning area, all of the potential historic districts should be considered highly sensitive for subsurface cultural deposits. Given the amount of undisturbed land that remains available for development, there remains the possibility that cultural resources may be disturbed through grading activities. Impacts upon archaeological resources could result from implementation of the proposed General Plan in the form of individual private development and public works projects. Two proposed General Plan Policies, 9.7.5 and 9.7.5.f, provide guidance for archaeological resources. Policy 9.7.5 requires the City to preserve and protect the City's historic structures and neighborhoods and to identify and preserve the archaeological and paleontological resources in the City. However, the policy does not determine what should occur when buried cultural resources including human remains are found. Therefore, the Draft EIR recommended mitigation measures 4.5.5.2A, 4.5.5.2B, 4.5.5.2C to address these issues. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.2A details the process if human remains are encountered during a public or private construction activity and Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.2B states that avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources and lists methods for protecting cultural resources. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures impacts to buried archaeological resources and buried human remains are less than significant impacts.

The City of Loma Linda has had a long-term interest in historical preservation as evidenced by an architectural/historical inventory of existing structures completed fourteen years ago and the inclusion of an historic preservation chapter in the zoning code. Although the architectural/historical inventory has accuracy and consistency issues and needs to be updated, the City is still committed to historical preservation as evidenced by the inclusion of historical preservation in four elements of the proposed General Plan. Proposed General Plan Policies pertaining to Historic Preservation include 2.2.8.4.d, 2.2.8.7.b, 3.2.1, 3.2.1.a-f, 8.6.7.g, 9.7.5, 9.7.5.a-e. These policies require various actions to preserve historic structures including General Plan Policy 9.7.5.a which requires the Update of the Survey of Historic Properties Inventory of 1988, taking into consideration buildings, neighborhoods, and other features of historic, architectural, or cultural significance. Policy 9.7.5.c requires the City to consider pursuing the designation of new historic landmarks. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies will require evaluation of new development in relationship to existing historical structures as well as the identification and preservation of existing historical structures. With new development projects required to adhere to these policies and the focus on preservation of existing historical structures, the implementation of the proposed General Plan will have a less than significant impact on historical structures or resources.

For additional discussion regarding the project's impact to cultural and paleontological resources, see Draft EIR, Section 4.5.

5.5 Geology and Soils

Potential Impacts. Future development permitted by the proposed General Plan may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from development on or adjacent to the San Jacinto Fault and/or as of yet undetected earthquake fault zones as stated in the Draft EIR p. 4.6-17.

The City of Loma Linda has and will continue to be subject to ground shaking resulting from activity on local and regional faults. Future development permitted by the proposed General Plan may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from this ground shaking hazard. Portions of Loma Linda are susceptible to liquefaction, a destructive secondary effect of strong seismic shaking. Future proposed General Plan development within Loma Linda would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in or near areas susceptible to liquefaction. Soils susceptible to subsidence may be affected by a variety of natural or human activities, including earthquakes and the withdrawal of subsurface fluids. Future development within the Planning Area would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to subsidence. Future development within the Planning Area would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to slope failure. Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in impacts related to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Areas exposed during development activities would be prone to soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Future development within the Planning Area would increase potential placement of residential and non-residential structures within areas susceptible to damage resulting from collapsible and expansive soils.

Findings. As stated in the Draft EIR on page 4.6-17, the San Jacinto Fault runs through the southern portion of the Planning Area and an earthquake hazard zone has been established along this trace fault, which recommends building setbacks varying from 50 to 100 feet. Future development on these lands, as envisioned in the proposed General Plan, may result in the construction and occupation of structures, critical facilities, and pipelines adjacent to known and/or as yet undetected earthquake fault zones. Such development would increase the number of persons and the amount of developed property exposed to fault rupture hazards. The proposed General Plan includes policies to reduce or minimize the effects associated with fault rupture on residents and habitable structures. While implementation of the aforementioned policies would reduce the significance of potential fault rupture impacts, they do not address potential impact related to undiscovered faults or impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. Mitigation measures were identified in the Draft EIR which will reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the impacts related to fault rupture will be reduced to less than significant.

The San Jacinto fault runs through the southern portion of the Planning Area and an earthquake hazard zone has been established along this trace fault, which recommends building setbacks varying from 50 to 100 feet. Development under the proposed General Plan may result in the total residential units in the Planning Area of about 15,052 residential units and employment for approximately 26,167 persons, thereby exposing more structures and people (residents and employees) to the effects of ground shaking. The City of Loma Linda has identified minimizing the risk of property damage and personal injury resulting from seismic and geologic hazards as one of its guiding policies in the Public Health and Safety Element of the proposed General Plan. While implementation of the aforementioned policies would reduce the significance of potential ground shaking impacts, they do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to potential ground shaking impacts, nor do they provide adequate mitigation for potential ground shaking impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To provide adequate mitigation for potential ground shaking hazards, mitigation was identified in the Draft EIR to provide flexibility to the City in requiring site-specific ground shaking assessment for any development subject to potential ground shaking impacts and to require adherence to identified design standards. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the impacts related to ground shaking will be reduced to less than significant.

Portions of the Planning Area are susceptible to liquefaction, a destructive secondary effect of strong seismic shaking. There are two specific areas in the Planning Area that are subject to liquefaction, located in the northwest and southwest corners of the Planning Area. The City of Loma Linda has identified minimizing the risk of property damage and personal injury resulting from liquefaction as one of its policies in the Public Health and Safety Element of the proposed General Plan. To ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are reduced to a less than significant level, mitigation measures were identified in the Draft EIR to provide flexibility to the City in requiring site-specific liquefaction assessments. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the impacts related to liquefaction hazards will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Parts of the Planning Area are located within areas susceptible to ground subsidence as stated in the Draft EIR, page 4.6-22. Build out of proposed General Plan will increase the number of persons, residential units, and non-residential development that would occur on soils susceptible to subsidence or soil collapse. The General Plan includes policies to reduce the potential impacts associated with development in areas where soils susceptible to subsidence are present, to a less than significant level.

As stated in the Draft EIR, page 4.6-23, the southern portion of the City has steep natural slopes, which are susceptible to instability. The type of instability anticipated in this area includes deep-seated landslides, surficial soil slips, wet debris flows, and surficial creep. Policies are constrained in the proposed General Plan to mitigate the potentially significant impacts associated with future development within the Planning Area. The proposed General Plan Policies address the potential for damage by requiring ongoing maintenance of manufactured slopes and soil analysis in areas of high-risk of slope failure. These policies ensure that potential slope failure impacts resulting from future development within the City are reduced to a less than significant level.

Soil erosion and loss of topsoil can be associated with groundbreaking excavation activities, such as grading or cut and fill for new development. An increase in population anticipated by the City's proposed General Plan would cause an increase in residential and non-residential structures, and allow activities resulting in the alteration and loss of existing topsoil. Soil erosion policies are located in the Conservation and Open Space Element and Public Health and Safety Element. These policies reduce the potential impacts, for soil erosion and loss of topsoil involving new development, to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the construction and occupation of structures within areas underlain by expansive soils. Expansive soil conditions are those soils with a significant amount of clay particles that have the ability to give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell) if not properly mitigated by site preparation and/or foundation design. Policies are identified in the proposed General Plan which will mitigate the potentially significant impacts associated with future development within the Planning Area.

Facts in Support of Findings. Development under the proposed General Plan may result in the total residential units in the Planning Area of about 15,052 and employment for approximately 26,167 persons, thereby exposing more structures and people (residents and employees) to the effects of a fault rupture. With this increase in development under the proposed General Plan, the number of persons and the amount of developed property exposed to fault rupture would increase. The proposed General Plan includes Policies 10.1.2, and 10.1.2.a-l which directly address ways to limit the potential impacts to structures located in the Alquist-Priolo (A-F) Fault Zones. Specially, General Plan Policy 10.1.2.a requires the City to limit development to low density in areas near geologic hazards such as the San Jacinto Fault that would create adverse conditions to those inhabiting the area and to the overall community. General Plan Policy 10.1.2.d. states that the City will identify and publicize the geologic and seismic hazards within Loma Linda and advice residents and property

owners of appropriate protection measures to reduce eliminate structural damage. While implementation of the aforementioned policies would reduce the significance of potential fault rupture impacts, they do not address potential impact related to undiscovered faults or impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To provide adequate mitigation for potential fault rupture hazards, mitigation measure 4.6.4.1A was identified in the Draft EIR to provide flexibility to the City of Loma Linda in requiring site-specific geotechnical investigations in any area falling within identified or as yet unidentified fault zones. Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.1A requires that before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within an A-P Zone or within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault, a site-specific geologic investigation shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of the project site. This site-specific evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to City of Loma Linda Community Development Department for review and approval as part of the environmental and entitlement process and prior to the issuance of building permits. The Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.1A be adopted. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the impacts related to fault rupture will be reduced to less than significant.

Earthquakes are a common occurrence in Southern California. Historically, Loma Linda has experienced the geologic affects of earthquakes outside the Planning Area. The San Jacinto fault runs through the southern portion of the Planning Area and an earthquake hazard zone has been established along this trace fault, which recommends building setbacks varying from 50 to 100 feet. The policies related to seismic hazards are found in the proposed General Plan in the Public Health and Safety Element. The proposed General Plan Policies (10.1.2. and 10.1.2.a-i) provide actions to reduce potential ground shaking impacts. Specifically, General Plan Policy 10.1.2.c requires the City to provide information and establish incentives such as free inspections or possibly reduced fees for property owners to rehabilitate existing buildings using construction techniques to protect against seismic hazards particularly in buildings with high occupancy such as churches and other places of assembly. General Plan Policy 10.1.2.e requires the City to encourage continued investigation by State agencies or geologic conditions within the Inland Empire to update knowledge of seismic hazards and promote public awareness. While implementation of the aforementioned policies would reduce the significance of potential ground shaking impacts, they do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to potential ground shaking impacts, nor do they provide adequate mitigation for potential ground shaking impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To provide adequate mitigation for potential ground shaking hazards, mitigation has been identified in the Draft EIR (Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.2A) to provide flexibility to the City in requiring site-specific ground shaking assessment for any development subject to potential ground shaking impacts and to require adherence to identified design standards. Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.2A requires that a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential ground shaking impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking hazards. The Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.2A be adopted. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measure, the impacts related to ground shaking will be reduced to less than significant.

According to the Draft EIR, page 4.6-21, liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated materials (including soil, sediment, and certain types of volcanic deposits) lose strength and may fail during strong ground shaking. Liquefaction is defined as "the transformation of a granular material from a solid state into a liquefied state as a consequence of increased pore-water pressure." The potential for liquefaction also depends on soil conditions and groundwater levels, which may fluctuate. Liquefaction occurs worldwide, commonly during moderate to great earthquakes. Portions of the

Planning Area are susceptible to liquefaction, a destructive secondary effect of strong seismic shaking. The City of Loma Linda has identified minimizing the risk of property damage and personal injury resulting from liquefaction as one of its policies in the Public Health and Safety Element of the proposed General Plan. Under General Plan Policy 10.1.2.h, a specialized soils report is required in areas suspected of having problems with potential liquefaction bearing strength, expansion, settlement, or subsidence, including implementation of the recommendations of these reports into the project development. Policies related to liquefaction are also include General Plan Policies 10.1.2, 10.1.2.e, 10.3.2., 10.3.2.a, and 10.3.2.c.

While implementation of the aforementioned policies would reduce the significance of potential liquefaction impacts, they do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to liquefaction, nor do they provide adequate mitigation for potential liquefaction impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. To ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are reduced to a less than significant level, mitigation measures were identified in the Draft EIR to provide flexibility to the City in requiring site-specific liquefaction assessments. Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.3A requires that as determined by the City, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential liquefaction impacts resulting from development. Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.3B requires that development proposed within an identified or potential liquefaction hazard area provide adequate and appropriate measures be implemented to reduce potential liquefaction hazards. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures, the impacts related to liquefaction hazards will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Parts of the Planning Area are located within areas susceptible to ground subsidence according to the Draft EIR, p. 4.6-22. Build out of proposed General Plan will increase the number of persons, residential units, and non-residential development that would occur on soils susceptible to subsidence or soil collapse. The proposed General Plan includes the following policies to reduce the potential impacts associated with development in areas where soils susceptible to subsidence are present. General Plan Policy 10.1.2.b requires a geologic and soils reports be prepared for proposed development sites, and incorporate the findings and recommendations of these studies into project development requirements. Additionally, General Plan Policy 10.1.2.h requires specialized soils reports in areas suspected of having problems with potential ground subsidence including implementation of the recommendations of these reports into the project development. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts related to ground subsidence will be re

According to the Draft EIR, page 4.6-23, the southern portion of the City has steep natural slopes, which are susceptible to instability. The type of instability anticipated in this area includes deep-seated landslides, surficial soil slips, wet debris flows, and surficial creep. The proposed General Plan Policies address the potential for damage by requiring ongoing maintenance of manufactured slopes and soil analysis in areas of high-risk of slope failure. Specifically, General Plan Policy 10.3.2.a limits cut and fill slopes to 2:1 (50%) slope throughout the City to maintain slope stability unless an engineering geologist can establish to the City's satisfaction that a steeper slope would not pose undue risk to people and property. General Plan Policy 10.3.2.c requires a geologic and soils reports as part of the development review process and/or building permit process for development in the hillside areas to minimize slope failure. General Plan Policies 10.3.2, 10.3.2.b, and 10.3.2.d also pertain to requirements to prevent slope failure. With implementation to the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts related to slope failure will be reduced to a less than significant level.

As stated in the Draft EIR, page 4.6-24, groundbreaking excavation activities can expose unprotected soils to storm water runoff causing erosion and loss of topsoil. In addition, exposure of underlying

soils during landform modifications substantially increases the potential for soil erosion. Soil erosion policies are located in the Conservation and Open Space Element and Public Health and Safety Element and include General Plan Policies 9.2.9.1.c, 9.2.9.1.d, 10.3.2, 10.3.2.b, and 10.3.2.d. Specifically General Plan Policy 9.2.9.1 requires new development to be designed to conserve soil and avoid erosion by limiting cut and fill areas and the exporting of soil from the development site. General Plan Policy 10.3.2.d requires erosion-control measures in areas of steep slopes or areas with high erosion problems on all grading plans to reduce soil erosion from wind, grading and construction operations, and stormwater runoff. With implementation to the proposed General Plan policies in addition to the UBC and California Building Code, the impacts from soil erosion will be reduced to a less than significant level.

According to the Draft EIR, page 4.6-25, when expansive soils shrink or swell, the change in volume exerts significant pressures on loads (such as buildings) that are placed on them. An increase in surface water infiltration, such as from irrigation, or a rise in the groundwater table, combined with the weight of a building or structure, can initiate settlement and cause foundations and walls to crack. Expansive soil conditions, if not properly mitigated by site preparation and/or foundation design, can cause substantial damage to structures and other improvements over time. Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the construction and occupation of structures within areas underlain by expansive soils. The proposed General Plan contains policies to reduce potential impacts associated with collapsible and expansive soils. The proposed General Plan policies require soil reports within areas susceptible of collapsible and expansive soil conditions (General Plan Policies 10.1.2., 10.1.2.b, and 10.1.2.h). In addition to soil report findings, project development requirements are to be enforced. Adherence to these policies will reduce potential impacts related to collapsible and expansive soils to a less than significant level.

5.6 Hazardous Materials

Potential Impacts. As was analyzed in the Draft EIR for the General Plan on page 4.7-5, implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in uncovering previously unknown hazardous materials contamination from historical use of property. As new commercial, business park, and/or industrial uses are constructed pursuant to the proposed General Plan, the potential for the storage, use, generation, and transportation of hazardous materials will increase, with associated increases in health and safety hazards. Build out of the proposed General Plan may also impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. In addition, implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the exposure of people and structures to wildland fire areas.

Findings. Many properties in the Planning Area were developed prior to the existing hazardous materials standards. As these properties are redeveloped, there is the likelihood that hazardous materials such as asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint could be encountered. There are many vacant parcels within the Planning Area which could be sites of earlier development or unknown dumping of potentially hazardous materials. The potential risks to associated with contamination of properties from historical uses have been reduced by existing federal, State and local policies and procedures that would require the delineation and remediation of sites containing hazardous substances to the satisfaction of the designated local enforcement agency and by a General Plan policy that requires a continued program of regular inspections and monitoring to ensure compliance with regulations. Compliance with existing regulations and a General Plan policy have been identified to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

As stated in the Draft EIR on page 4.7-6, generally, hazardous materials are commonly used in all segments of our society, including manufacturing and service industries, commercial enterprises, agriculture, military bases, hospitals, schools, and households. The proposed land uses in the

General Plan generally will result in more than a doubling of commercial, business park, and industrial uses within the Planning Area. Recognizing the importance of protecting public safety relating to the handling and exposure of the community to hazardous materials, the proposed General Plan policies address this issue through monitoring compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. The policies also seek a reduction in hazardous materials users and generators through the encouragement and assistance in the reduction of hazardous waste from businesses and homes in the City. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts associated with the risk of hazardous materials exposure would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The new residential and non-residential structures which would be constructed with the implementation of the proposed General Plan are not currently included in adopted emergency response plans. The increase in population and resulting potential traffic congestion could cause emergency response delays. The Loma Linda Emergency Operations Plan identifies the City's emergency planning, organization, and response policies and procedures. It identifies how the City will respond to extraordinary events or disasters, from preparation through recovery. The City of Loma Linda recognizes that the planning process must address a wide range of hazards that could potentially threaten the City, including natural, technological, man-made, and national security disasters. The plan addresses the integration and coordination with other agencies and governmental levels when required. In addition, the plan provides assistance in the development of department Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). The plan also discusses after-action reporting procedures and possible disaster assistance programs depending on the type of emergency. The proposed General Plan policies ensure that emergency preparedness programs are maintained and properly coordinated throughout the Planning Area. With the implementation of these policies, the impact of new development on emergency plans would be less than significant.

As stated in the Draft EIR on page 4.7-13, recent residential development intrusion into the lower foothills to the south and southwest creates additional problems in controlling a wildland fire. These problems are due to limited firefighting facilities in the area, and the lack of direct access to the areas, which lengthens response times. The risk of fire damage to structures can be minimized with appropriate spacing of structures, brush clearance, fuel modification zones, building material, water availability and adherence to State and local fire codes. Additionally, the Public Safety Department takes part in an annual public educational program directed towards residences in hazardous fire areas. An informative pamphlet is distributed on the doors of those that live in or near the hazardous fire areas recognized by the City. Information contained in the pamphlets educates residents on vegetation management, clearance standards of brush/vegetation next to structures and access roads/ driveways, and chimney/fireplace safety tips. The proposed General Plan policies seek to minimize the risks associated with placing structures and people in wildland fire areas. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impact associated with the exposure of persons and structures to wildland fire areas is less than significant.

Facts in Support of Findings. General Plan Policy 10.5.2.c establishes a program of regular inspections and monitoring to ensure compliance with local, State, and federal regulations which would assist in the discovery of hazardous materials should redevelopment or new developments occur. In addition, should contamination be found or disturbed, existing Federal, State, and local regulations and procedures would require the delineation and remediation of sites containing hazardous substances to the satisfaction of the designated local enforcement agency. Moreover, it is unlikely that any such contamination or disturbance would be extensive beyond the capabilities of typical remediation measures which are covered in a General Plan Update implementing policy. The implementation of proposed General Plan policies will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Hazardous materials are commonly used by all segments of society including manufacturing and service industries, commercial enterprises, agriculture, military bases, hospitals, schools, and households. If improperly handled, stored, or disposed of, these materials can have substantial health and environmental consequences. While the risk of exposure to hazardous materials cannot be eliminated, adherence to General Plan Policies 10.5.2.b, 10.5.2.d, 10.5.2.e, 10.5.2.g, and 10.5.2.i plus compliance with regulations, standards, and guidelines relating to storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials established by the Environmental Protection Agency, State, County, and local agencies will reduce the potential risk of hazardous materials exposure to a less than significant level within the Planning Area.

Proposed General Plan Policies 10.6.2, and 10.6.2.a through 10.6.2.e ensure that emergency preparedness programs are maintained and properly coordinated throughout the Planning Area. The policies also address the regular review of these programs and the creation of new programs to further ensure the safety of the City and areas within the General Plan Planning Area during and after disasters. With the implementation of these policies, the impact of new development on emergency plans would be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan policies seek to minimize the risks associated with placing structures and people in wildland fire areas. While the risks are not eliminated, the proposed General Plan policies emphasize following all known safety measures. With these safety measures in place and following State and Federal guidelines, the impacts to people and property will be reduced to a less than significant level. Additional discussion of hazardous materials and fire hazards is located in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.7-1.

5.7 Water Resources

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the proposed Loma Linda General Plan may increase the demand for water and may contribute to the depletion of groundwater supplies, thereby reducing water availability to existing well users. New development permitted pursuant to the proposed General Plan will increase the amount of impervious surfaces and result in the loss of water recharge areas. Build out of the proposed General Plan may increase the demand for water services such that it exceeds the existing and planned facilities. During future construction activities and post-construction uses associated with build out of the proposed General Plan, water quality or waste discharge requirements may be violated. The increase in demand for water due to proposed General Plan permitted uses may affect water availability for emergency fire flow.

Findings. Groundwater pumped by the City comes from Bunker Hill Basin. The production and distribution of water within the City of Loma Linda is provided by the City's Department of Public Works, Water Division. As shown in Table 4.8.H in the Draft EIR, the average water demand at build out of the proposed General Plan is projected to be 6,083 gpm, and the maximum project demand is projected to reach 12,144 gpm. As shown in Table 4.8.A of the Draft EIR, the existing well capacity is 7,900 gpm. Therefore, currently there is enough water production to meet the project average daily requirements at build out; however, there is not enough to supply water on a peak demand day. In order to meet the projected water demand at build out, new wells would need to be constructed. Although the City of Loma Linda has ascertained that there is presently enough water supply in the Bunker Hills basin to serve its future needs, the City is not the only community using that basin for water supplies. The proposed General Plan contains policies to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan; however impacts associated with an increased demand for water and the depletion of groundwater supplies remain significant and unavoidable.

The groundwater pumped by the City comes from the Bunker Hill Basin, which is replenished mainly from rainfall and snowmelt from the San Bernardino Mountains. Other sources of recharge include

excess irrigation, incidental percolation from reclaimed water ponds, and recharge of off-season imported water in recharge ponds managed by water agencies. Efficient groundwater recharge depends on a variety of conditions including permeable surfaces. Increased development reduces the amount of permeable surfaces suitable for recharge, increases the rate and volume of runoff and the subsequent flow of water in streams, and increases the amount of oil and grease and other non-point source pollutants that enter streambeds and recharge areas. The proposed General Plan policy and mitigation measure requiring new development to incorporate features to facilitate the on-site infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff into groundwater basins reduces the potential impacts of the proposed General Plan below a level of significance.

New development within the City pursuant to implementation of the proposed General Plan will require the installation of additional water transmission and distribution lines, as well as pipelines (purple pipe) for reclaimed water for the purpose of irrigation systems. The City's Water Master Plan (pages 5-8) states that the City's water distribution system is generally hydraulically adequate with respect to pipelines through build out of the proposed General Plan, with the exception of two areas. Additional pipelines are recommended, especially in the North Central Neighborhood. New pipelines required for new development will be installed and/or financed by the developer. With the proposed General Plan policies in place, the impacts associated with the distribution of water would be reduced to less than a significant level.

Future construction, grading, and excavation would cause temporary disturbance of surface soils which would likely produce silt and debris during runoff, resulting in a short-term increase in the sediment load of the storm drain system serving the City. Federal law requires the City of Loma Linda to implement the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for municipal and private projects to protect groundwater recharge areas from construction runoff and other potential sources of pollutant runoff. Therefore, adherence to the proposed General Plan policies and implementation of Federal law will reduce impacts related to water quality to less than significant.

The volume of water allocated for emergency uses is typically determined based on the historical record of emergencies experienced and on the amount of time expected to lapse before an anticipated emergency can be corrected. The City of Loma Linda recognizes the importance of maintaining adequate fire flow in a General Plan policy. With the proposed General Plan policies in place, the impacts on fire flow from the implementation of the proposed General Plan would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Facts in Support of Findings. As stated in the Draft EIR on pages 4.8-14 and 4.8-15, the City of Loma Linda will not have enough water to supply the proposed General Plan build out on a peak demand day. With increased development in the planning area, anticipated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan, water resources will continue to diminish not only for the City of Loma Linda but also for the rest of the communities in Southern California. As the rest of the region grows and as the native water supply decreases, the region's dependence on imported water grows and water conservation, including the use of reclaimed water and control of water runoff pollution becomes critical to not only Loma Linda but the entire region. The City has identified the provision and protection of water resources as one of prime importance in the implementation of the proposed General Plan. General Plan policies 8.7.2, 8.7.2.a, 8.7.2.c, 8.7.2.f, 9.6.2, and 9.6.2.a through 9.6.2.f recognize the water supply issues and encourage the use of water conservation measures. However, the City does not assure the provision of water supplies adequate to support development that may occur as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan. It is found that there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could be adopted at this time which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. To the extent that this adverse impact will not be eliminated or lessened to an acceptable (less than significant) level, it is found that specific economic,

legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the project as modified, despite unavoidable residual impacts.

The groundwater pumped by the City comes from the Bunker Hill Basin, which is replenished mainly from rainfall and snowmelt from the San Bernardino Mountains. Typical groundwater recharge programs artificially replenish groundwater in wet years with surplus imported water. Water is withdrawn from groundwater reserves during periods of drought or during emergency situations. Although proposed General Plan Policy 2.2.3.1.m provides for the protection of watersheds, there are no policies which reduce or minimize potential impacts that implementation of the proposed General Plan may have on groundwater recharge. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measure which requires requiring new development to incorporate features to facilitate the on-site infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff into groundwater basins will reduce the potential impacts of the proposed General Plan below a level of significance.

New pipelines required for new development will be installed and/or financed by the developer. Policies 8.7.2, 8.7.2.a, 8.7.2.b, 8.7.2.c, and 8.7.2.g in the proposed General Plan address the issue of Loma Linda's water distribution in the City. With these policies in place, and the recognized policy of developers providing required new distribution lines, the impacts associated with the distribution of water would be reduced to less than a significant level.

Future construction, grading, and excavation would cause temporary disturbance of surface soils which would likely produce silt and debris during runoff, resulting in a short-term increase in the sediment load of the storm drain system serving the City. Substances such as oils, fuels, paints and solvents may be transported to nearby drainage systems, watersheds and groundwater recharge areas. Source-control Best Management Practices are required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in its water discharge permits. All new development would be required to comply with these legal/regulatory requirements. Adherence to General Plan Policy 9.6.2.g and implementation of Federal law will reduce impacts related to water quality to less than significant.

Because the occurrence and magnitude of an emergency situation is not subject to accurate evaluation, the volume of emergency storage is generally based upon engineering judgment and/or utility policy. Although General Plan Policies 8.7.2 and 8.7.2.d call for the provision of a water system that will have sufficient water in storage reservoirs for emergency and fire protection, mitigation is necessary to address the need for water storage capacity in Zone 4. Implementation of proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measure which requires development in Zone 4 to provide appropriate water storage capacity and hydraulic pumps as necessary to meet required water and fire flow during emergencies would reduce the impacts on fire flow from the implementation of the proposed General Plan to a less than significant level.

Further discussion of the impacts to Water Resources can be found in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.8-1.

5.8 Land Use and Agricultural Resources

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would change the predominant agricultural land use pattern in the eastern section of the Planning Area, thus changing the predominant character of the area. According to the Draft EIR for the General Plan on page 4.9-12, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in changes to existing land use designations in certain areas which could negatively affect the existing pattern of development as well as the surrounding uses. With a small portion of the City of Loma Linda located within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area in the "draft" land use plan, proposed land use

designations may be incompatible with the “draft” Airport Land Use Commission’s plan for the influence area.

Findings. Currently, the Planning Area contains about 889 acres of land in agricultural use with approximately 386 acres in the City and approximately 503 acres existing in the sphere of influence. The City has always considered that agricultural uses will transition to urban uses since the time of incorporation as evidenced by the fact that the original General Plan Land Use Plan does not include an agricultural land use designation even though this area contains State prime and unique farmland. The agricultural land fronting on Redlands Boulevard and fronting on Barton Avenue have been planned for housing and special development since 1989. The proposed General Plan policies provide clear direction that the intent of the City is to encourage the conversion of existing agricultural uses to urban uses. With implementation of proposed General Plan policies, impacts associated with the change from a predominately agricultural land use pattern to urban uses are less than significant.

One of the primary purposes of land use planning in the proposed General Plan is the generation of a land use plan which represents the City’s vision of its future. Most of the proposed land use changes involve the consolidation of residential use designations. The General Plan Land Use Map currently utilized incorporates eleven different land use categories. The proposed General Plan reduces the number of land use designations to seven by combining redundant land use categories such as High density Residential 11-20 and Very High Density 13.1-20 into one category. The proposed General Plan policies support the vision of the City to continue to be a small, friendly, beautiful community with natural assets, unique economy and healthy lifestyle. In addition, the proposed General Plan policies further the vision of the City as the location of diverse housing opportunities where the natural environment is protected and enhanced. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts to land use changes will be reduced to less than significant.

The San Bernardino International Airport, a commercial airport with an instrument landing system and a 10,000-foot runway, is located 1.5 miles from the northern boundary of the City. As shown in Draft EIR Figure 4.9.3, portions of the City fall within the 2-mile radius considered within the airport influence area. The City is obligated to have its general plan be consistent with the approved Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. When a project, under jurisdiction of the City of Loma Linda, is proposed within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area, it will be reviewed for compatibility with the provisions of the airport land use plan. At the time of the preparation of the City’s General Plan, the San Bernardino International Airport land use plan was not adopted. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would not result in any safety hazards related to airports.

Facts in Support of Findings. General Plan policies 9.5.2, 9.5.2.a, and 9.5.2.b provide clear direction that the intent of the City is to encourage the conversion of existing agricultural uses to urban uses. With this stated purpose, the change in character of the agricultural areas is sought by the City and would be considered a positive effect of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the change in land use character of the eastern portion of the Planning Area is considered a positive outcome and would be considered less than significant.

The proposed General Plan recognizes the City’s unique economy as evidenced by its recognition of the importance of Loma Linda University and the various extensive medical facilities in the community, promoting mixed-use development throughout the community and in recognizing the sensitivity of development impacts that may occur in the hillside by addressing development in this area based on slope gradient and the proposed land use designation are compatible with those in the surrounding areas and their associated development patterns. The proposed policies in the General Plan cover possible land use conflicts while addressing standards for new development. With

implementation of proposed General Plan policies contained in the Land Use Element, impacts associated with the change in land use designations and patterns of development in the City as well as the surrounding area is considered less than significant.

Portions of the City fall within the 2-mile radius considered within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area. General Plan policies 10.7.2.1, 10.7.2a, and 10.7.2b support the vision of the San Bernardino Airport Land Use Commission. Implementation of the policies will ensure land use designations are compatible with those uses in the surrounding area and their associated development patterns. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts to land use changes will be reduced to less than significant.

Further discussion of the impacts to Land Uses and Agricultural Resources is located in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.9-1.

5.9 Flood Hazards

Potential Impacts. As stated in the Draft EIR on page 4.10-12, implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in exposure of people or structures to the impacts of flooding through the placement of structures in the 100-500 year floodplain. Future development under the proposed General Plan would likely result in a net increase in impervious surfaces (i.e., roads, parking lots, buildings). An increase in impervious surfaces reduces the amount of rainfall that can infiltrate into the subsurface. Increases in runoff can amplify drainage volumes and velocities causing storm drainage facilities that are at or near capacity to fail during peak events. This excess runoff may result in localized ponding and/or flooding. Therefore, the implementation of development in accordance with the proposed General Plan may result in significant impacts related to existing drainage facilities.

Findings. Flooding represents a potential hazard within the Planning Area. The majority of the area potentially subject to flood hazards is located in the northern portion of the Planning Area, as shown in Figure 4.10.1 in the Draft EIR. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the City's population and total acreage of development. While most of the potential flooding hazards are in the northern section of the City, new development in the Southern Hills area could be affected by flood hazards if located near naturally occurring streambeds or aboveground storage tanks. The implementation of the proposed General Plan policies would require new projects to not only evaluate stormwater runoff from their project sites but also require construction of needed drainage and flood control facilities. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measure prohibiting development within the 100-year floodplain will reduce potential flooding impacts that may result from the build out of the Planning Area (as envisioned in the proposed General Plan) to less than significant levels.

Build out of the proposed General Plan will increase the number of impervious surfaces throughout the Planning Area. New development that would increase the area of impervious surfaces would increase the volume and rate of stormwater entering the current drainage system, which may exceed the capacity of the system. Development will increase and concentrate runoff, which, if not controlled, may accelerate the rates of erosion of unprotected surfaces. The implementation of the proposed General Plan policies would require new projects to not only evaluate stormwater runoff from their project sites, but also to provide perpetual maintenance of detention basins if necessary and require new development to incorporate features that would reduce impermeable surface area, increase surface water infiltration, and minimize surface water runoff. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impacts related to flood hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Facts in Support of Findings. While the majority of the area potentially subject to flood hazards is located in the northern portion of the Planning Area, local topography and the presence of a number of large aboveground water storage tanks increase the potential for flood events in other portions of the Planning Area. The San Bernardino County Flood Control District maintains three regionally significant storm drain facilities within the City. General Plan Policies 10.2.3.a through 10.2.3.g address the maintenance of these storm drains, and requires new projects to evaluate stormwater runoff from their project site, and minimize the surface waste runoff created by the project. Additionally, new development projects will be required to provide for the maintenance of stormwater facilities which serve their needs. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the mitigation measure prohibiting development within the 100 year floodplain, the impacts related to flood hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The natural materials in the Planning Area are relatively susceptible to erosion. Development within the Planning Area, especially in the southern portion, will increase the potential for soil erosion. Increased rates of erosion will likely accelerate sedimentation of drainage channels and flood control features, which may impact the effectiveness of these features. Development which encompasses 1.0 acre or more is required to comply with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which regulates the pollutant discharges from developed sites. The City will continue to require existing and new development to adhere to the applicable provisions required by existing permits. With implementation of proposed General Plan Policies 10.2.3.a, 10.2.3.c, and 10.2.3.d, potential stormwater drainage impacts resulting from build out of the Planning Area will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Further discussion of the impacts to Flooding Hazards is located in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.10-1.

5.10 Noise

Potential Impacts. As stated on page 4.11-18 in the Draft EIR, noise levels from grading and other construction activities would potentially result in noise levels reaching 91 dBA L_{max} at off-site locations 50 feet from the site boundary, potentially impacting off-site sensitive receptors adjacent to individual construction sites. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in potential long-term vehicular noise that would affect sensitive land uses along the roads. New development, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to major transit corridors, could be exposed to excessive traffic-related noise levels. New development associated with the proposed General Plan could expose existing and/or new sensitive uses to stationary noise sources, such as those generated by industrial and/or commercial uses. Although the proposed General Plan would not result in potential project-related increases in railroad noise, there could be new proposed sensitive land uses along and adjacent to the railroads that would be affected by high noise levels from railroad operations.

Findings. As stated on page 4.11-19 in the Draft EIR, implementation of projects allowed by the proposed General Plan would result in construction at various sites throughout the City. The transport of workers and construction equipment and materials to these project sites would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to these sites. Noise generated during excavation, grading, and building construction on development sites would result in potential noise impacts to off-site uses while construction occurs. While the proposed General Plan policies provide guidance and standards for reducing noise impacts due to construction, additional measures are necessary to further ensure that the impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. The impacts of noise during construction would be short-term in duration and the policies in the proposed General Plan and the mitigation measures would reduce the impacts from construction noise to less than significant level.

As stated on page 4.11-22 of the Draft EIR for the General Plan, new developments within the City of Loma Linda and regional growth will result in an increase in traffic within the City. Existing sensitive receptors in the city would be potentially affected by noise associated with these new traffic trips. The projected future build out traffic noise in the City ranges from moderate to high, with the 70 dBA CNEL confined within the roadway right-of-way for 33 of the 58 of the surface street segments analyzed. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the stated mitigation will reduce potential traffic-related noise impacts to a less than significant level.

The development of new industrial and commercial uses pursuant to the proposed General Plan and related actions may increase noise levels in their vicinity due to the establishment of new stationary noise sources. Although vehicular noise is exempt from local regulation when operating on public streets, cities can regulate vehicular noise while operating on private property. New projects developed under the proposed General Plan would be subject to the City's noise ordinance and the provisions of the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies will reduce potential stationary impacts to a less than significant level.

As stated on page 4.11-29 of the Draft EIR, new development, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to railroad corridors, could be exposed to excessive train-related noise levels. An increase in rail usage is expected in the future, due to the establishment and expansion of commuter rail services. The policies in the proposed General Plan would reduce the effect of railroad noise on sensitive land uses, thus ensuring noise impacts that are less than significant.

Facts in Support of Findings. Short-term noise impacts would be associated with excavation, grading, and erecting buildings during construction of individual projects allowed through the implementation of the proposed General Plan. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area today, but would cease once construction of the project is completed. While the proposed General Plan policies provide guidance and standards for reducing noise impacts due to construction, additional measures are necessary to further ensure that the impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. Construction impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan would still occur with the implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures. However, the impacts would be short-term in duration and General Plan Policies 7.8.1.1.h through 7.8.1.1.i and Mitigation Measures 4.11.5.1A through E would reduce the impacts from construction noise to less than significant level. The proposed mitigation measures provide performance standards related to noise which must be followed at all construction sites. These performance standards regulate the hours of construction, the timing of pile-driving, the location of stationary noise sources, the use of best available noise control techniques for equipment and trucks, and a method of tracking and responding to noise complaints. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted.

Long-term noise impacts would be associated with mobile and vehicular noise sources, as well as stationary industrial and commercial noise sources. Future increased traffic in the Planning Area would add up to 7.0 dBA to area roadway links. More than half of the roadway links analyzed have the 65 dBA CNEL contour extending outside the roadway right-of-way. The 65 dBA CNEL extends up to 307 feet from the centerline of the road. Although proposed General Plan Policies 7.8.1.2.a through 7.8.1.2.f provide guidance and standards for reducing traffic-related noise impacts, Mitigation Measures 4.11.5.2A through C are necessary to further reduce noise impacts. These mitigation measures require buildings associated with noise-sensitive uses and exposed to significant traffic noises be equipped with air conditioning and incorporate upgraded building facades. Additionally, outdoor active use areas would need to be protected by sound walls. The Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and the

stated mitigation measures will reduce potential traffic-related noise impacts to a less than significant level.

The use of heavy trucks on private properties (e.g., making deliveries to commercial and industrial uses) will result in noise levels of 73 dBA at 50 feet from the source of the noise (e.g., truck's engine). The use of multiple trucks on a site, such as might occur at a warehouse, could generate noise levels of about 80 dBA L_{eq} as measured at a distance of 50 feet. Industrial processing equipment and conducting outdoor industrial activities could also generate increased noise levels. New projects developed under the proposed General Plan would be subject to the City's noise ordinance and Policies 7.8.1.1a through 7.8.1.1h of the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies will reduce potential stationary noise impacts to a less than significant level.

New proposed sensitive land uses located along and adjacent to existing railroads would be exposed to increased noise levels as future increases in rail usage occur. The proposed General Plan's land use noise compatibility and mobile source noise policies would apply to railroad noise within the City, thus ensuring noise impacts that are less than significant.

Further discussion of Noise impacts is located in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.11-1.

5.11 Population and Housing

Potential Impacts. Build out of the Loma Linda General Plan will increase the study area's population, both directly as the result of residential development, and indirectly through commercial/industrial development. This growth will not exceed the housing and population projections for the Planning Area, as shown in Table 4.12F on page 4.12-6 of the Draft EIR.

As stated on page 4.12-6 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed General Plan would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of residential units and persons. Upon build out of the proposed General Plan, approximately 15,052 residential units are projected to exist within the Planning Area. Development will occur on vacant or agricultural land and would not displace residential units or persons; therefore, no impact would occur.

As stated on page 4.12-7 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in an increase in employment growth within the City exacerbating the jobs-to-housing balance. Even though the City of Loma Linda is expected to have many more jobs than households by 2025, other cities within San Bernardino County are expected to have a much lower jobs-to-household ratio. Because Loma Linda's numerous jobs will help to balance the numerous households in surrounding cities, a balance between the number of jobs and households will exist within the region by 2025, and the jobs within Loma Linda will have a beneficial effect on the region. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed General Plan will help to balance land uses regionally and no adverse impact associated with this issue would occur.

Findings. Projections for population, employment, and residential dwellings were identified to reflect the "theoretical" build out of the Loma Linda General Plan Planning Area, utilizing land use designations and assumptions detailed in the proposed General Plan. A General Plan is, by definition, growth inducing in that it provides a plan for accommodating future increases in population, housing, and employment. The proposed General Plan includes areas outside the Loma Linda City limits and the land uses proposed permit extensive development within portions of Loma Linda's sphere of influence. The proposed General Plan will result in a potential cumulative impact on employment, housing, and population. This potential impact is considered substantial, but not adverse, in light of the project's contribution to improved jobs/housing balance and transportation demand management promoted by SCAG's regional policies. Therefore, there are no significant

unavoidable adverse impacts related to population and housing for the reasons set forth in the Draft EIR.

Facts in Support of Findings. The proposed General Plan and the EIR use the build out year of 2025 as an assumption for analysis purposes. Build out of the proposed General Plan by 2025 would be a worst-case scenario. Regional economics and the marketplace will dictate the build out of the proposed General Plan and dictate how accurate projections are. Because the proposed General Plan assumes build out in 2025 that does not exceeds the currently adopted SCAG regional projections for 2025 build out, exceeding the regional population and housing projections would not be considered a significant unavoidable impact.

5.12 Public Services and Utilities

Potential Impacts. The future development envisioned by the Loma Linda Planning Area will increase the demand for public services and facilities. Demands on fire and police protection will increase as the result of residential, commercial, business park, and industrial development with the implementation of the proposed General Plan. In locations where new development occurs, additional fire protection services would be needed. In addition, there could be an increase in student enrollment within the Redlands Unified School District (RUSD), Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD), and the San Bernardino Superintendent of Schools with the built out of the City. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increased demand for sewer services within the Planning Area. The increase in development would result in increased demand for solid waste services and an increase in the demand for landfill capacity.

Findings. According to the Draft EIR on page 4.13-6, development associated with the implementation of proposed General Plan would require additional on-duty firefighters and a new fire station facility in the South Hills portion of the city. The City of Loma Linda's Fire and Rescue Division's ability to provide fire protection services to support the needs of future growth is dependent upon its ability to construct, staff, and equip this new fire station as the need for fire protection services increases with development. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and City requirements would reduce potential impacts related to the effects of future development on fire protection services by reducing the threat of fire, improving firefighting infrastructure, and ensuring that future growth does not exceed acceptable levels of service.

The Planning Area is served by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. With the increase in businesses and industries, the daytime population would also increase and require new police services. The use of community arterial roadways, including Barton Road, Redlands Boulevard, Anderson Street and Mountain Avenue would also increase, which would impact enforcement of traffic laws. The proposed General Plan includes goals that address the level of police services to be maintained to accommodate long-term growth and a requirement to continuously evaluate the provision of police services provided. With implementation of these proposed General Plan Policies, potential impacts to police protection services would be reduced to a less than significant impact. For additional discussion of the impacts to police protection, see DEIR Section 4.13.2.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the number of dwelling units in the Planning Area thereby increasing the number of students attending local schools. The greatest residential growth in the Planning Area is projected to occur in the South Hills portion of the city. The Redlands Unified School District (RUSD) and Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD) would need to build new schools with build out of the proposed General Plan. The proposed General Plan includes policies to address the need for school facilities and provide the maximum mitigation allowable under State law. The maximum mitigation is a development fee based on the particular school district's need and this fee will be imposed on all new development. Because the Government

Code states that compliance with Senate Bill 50 will provide full and complete mitigation, no significant impacts will occur.

The City of Loma Linda is considered a "job rich" community as the number of jobs available in the city totaled 14,733 in 2000 (as determined by the 2001 RTP Growth Forecast) while the number of employed persons over the age of 16 living within the City totaled 8,679 (according to the 2000 Census). However, unlike many communities with substantial local employment, a large percentage of Loma Linda's workforce is already locally employed. Loma Linda University and associated medical institutions including the Veterans Hospital are the largest employers in the City providing employment for the residents of City of Loma Linda.

Future wastewater flows are based on ultimate build out of the City based on land uses identified in the General Plan. The City of Loma Linda's capacity is based upon a Joint Powers Agreement with the City of San Bernardino. The implementation of the proposed General Plan will initiate an increase for wastewater services as demand increases. The proposed General Plan policies ensure that new development provides adequate infrastructure for average and peak wastewater conditions. In addition, the proposed General Plan policies state that the City will ensure that adequate infrastructure is in place and operational prior to occupancy of new development; such that new development will not negatively impact the performance of sewer facilities serving existing developed areas. Implementation of these proposed General Plan policies and the continual updating of the Master Plan for sewer facilities would ensure that adequate wastewater facilities are in place to accommodate existing and future development, thereby reducing effects associated with future development to a less than significant level. The Master Plan for sewer facilities would ensure that infrastructure is sufficiently in place to accommodate existing for safe disposal of sewage.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan will increase the number of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses within the City and, therefore, the demand for solid waste services will increase. The ability to dispose of solid waste in Loma Linda is tied to available landfill capacity and compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) diversion rate of 50 percent. The proposed General Plan policies recognize both the need to reduce solid waste and the need to limit the locations of solid waste transfer stations. Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, in addition to continued compliance with the State-mandated 50 percent reduction in solid waste, would reduce solid waste impacts to less than significant.

Facts in Support of Findings. The City of Loma Linda has indicated that the southern portion of the City, south of the Hillside Initiative Boundary, may need a second fire station for several reasons. The City's ability to provide fire protection services to support the needs of future growth is dependent upon its ability to construct, staff, and equip a new fire station as the need for fire protection services increases with development. The funding for the construction of the necessary facilities, as specified in the policies of the proposed General Plan, will be provided by development served by the facilities. Implementation of proposed General Plan Policies outline in Section 8.1.2 (Guiding Policy) and existing City requirements would reduce potential impacts related to the effects of future development on fire protection services by reducing the threat of fire, improving firefighting infrastructure, and ensuring that future growth does not exceed acceptable levels of service. The aforementioned General Plan policies also provide for timely assessment of emergency services to ensure the levels of service are being met and provide for funding of the necessary services by requiring new development to pay its fair share. Therefore, potential impacts related to fire protection services due to the implementation of the proposed General Plan will be reduced to a less than significant level.

The City of Loma Linda's current police officer to population ratio is 1 sworn officer per 2,479 residents. The population within the City limits at build out is anticipated to be 32,890. Based on this population, the City would need a total of 15 sworn officers to service the City at build out. Currently,

the City employs 12 sworn officers. The City of Loma Linda has identified protection from crime as one of its goals. The proposed General Plan includes policies that address the level of police services to be maintained to accommodate long-term growth and a requirement to continuously evaluate the provision of police services provided. These policies also require new development to fund the facilities and services necessary to maintain the proposed General Plan goals pertaining to level of service. With implementation of these proposed General Plan policies, potential impacts to police protection services would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the number of dwelling units in the Planning Area and, therefore, the number of students attending local schools would also increase. The greatest residential growth in the Planning Area is projected to occur in the South Hills portion of the city. This area is projected to contain approximately 1,185 new dwellings at General Plan build out. State law limits the power of the City to impose mitigation for development impacts on schools. The proposed General Plan includes policies that address the need for school facilities and provide the maximum mitigation allowable under State law. The proposed General Plan policies require mitigation of impacts on school facilities and services be provided as development occurs. Because Government Code 65996(a) and (b) state that compliance with payment of maximum school fees provides full and complete mitigation, no significant impacts will occur. For additional discussion regarding the project's impacts to schools, see DEIR Section 4.13.3.

The projected wastewater flow at build out of the proposed General Plan is 3.63 mgd. With a current treatment capacity of allotment of 7 mgd from the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, the proposed General Plan projected build out wastewater demand would be less than the capacity allotment by 0.73 mgd. The City of Loma Linda's capacity is based upon an agreement with the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department. Proposed General Plan policies ensure that new development provides adequate infrastructure for average and peak wastewater conditions. Implementation of these policies and the continual updating of the Master Plan for sewer facilities would ensure that adequate wastewater facilities are in place to accommodate existing and future development, thereby reducing effects associated with future development to a less than significant level.

The ability to dispose of solid waste in Loma Linda is tied to available landfill capacity and compliance with the CIWMB diversion rate of 50 percent. The City of Loma Linda is currently in an agreement with Waste Management of the Inland Empire and transports solid waste not recycled to the San Timoteo Solid Waste Disposal Site. It is estimated that San Timoteo will reach final capacity by 2016, California Street Sanitary Landfill by the end of 2007, Colton by 2006, Barstow by 2012, Fontana by 2033, Victorville by 2005, and Landers by 2007. With the majority of the landfills in the County scheduled to close before 2010, the proposed General Plan recognizes both the need to reduce solid waste and the need to assist the County in expanding landfill capacity. The County Integrated Waste Management Plan has projected that the San Timoteo landfill will be viable for the next 15 years. While the City can rely on landfill capacity during the next 15 years, assurances are not available after that time period. However, it is expected that compliance with the State-mandated 50 percent reduction in solid waste and implementation of the proposed General Plan policies would reduce solid waste impacts to less than significant.

5.13 Transportation/Traffic

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the proposed General Plan will facilitate the development of residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and other types of projects that will result in increased traffic volumes. This increase in traffic volumes could, in turn, result in congestion along area roadways and highways. The proposed General Plan and related actions are not expected to result in an inadequate parking supply because the proposed General Plan and related actions do not modify

current parking standards. Future developments will continue to supply parking according to City code requirements.

The proposed General Plan and related actions are not expected to result in inadequate emergency vehicle access. In addition, the existing City requirements for the provision of emergency access to development projects will continue to be implemented. It is not expected that future congestion will significantly affect emergency vehicle access due to the availability of alternate routes and improvements to key roadways to maintain standards. Also, the City will implement traffic signal system upgrades that help to facilitate more efficient emergency vehicle access and give priority to emergency vehicles.

The proposed General Plan and related actions are not expected to result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. Implementation of existing City requirements and the provisions of Section 6.10.2 (Non-Motorized Transportation) of the proposed General Plan would avoid significant impacts to pedestrian and bicycle travel by providing for a bicycle and trails network and supporting the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians. The City will continue to require development projects to provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities according to City codes, and as a result of the development review process. The proposed General Plan and related actions are also not expected to result in conflicts with regional transportation policies on alternative transportation, since Section 6.10.2 of the proposed General Plan objectives and policies support alternative transportation and increased use of transit services.

Findings. Future growth associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan and related actions will result in a substantial increase in the traffic that is generated throughout the Loma Linda Planning Area. This traffic will affect not only Loma Linda, but also surrounding lands within unincorporated areas. Development consistent with the implementation of the proposed General Plan will facilitate new growth within the Planning Area that will generate additional roadway traffic. Analysis shows that several roadway linkages are projected to operate at LOS E or F at build out. This analysis assumed a series of roadway widenings, intersection improvements, and other measures that are part of the Transportation and Circulation Element and are considered reasonably foreseeable. The analysis of cumulative future traffic that will be generated at build out of the proposed General Plan and following implementation of related actions indicates that level of service standards will be met. Thus, the proposed General Plan will reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

Facts in Support of Findings. The analysis conducted by LSA Associates in a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) January 2004 evaluated the impacts of the proposed Loma Linda General Plan. The TIA was prepared to analyze the impacts on the transportation and circulation system from build-out of the proposed General Plan land uses. Land use input to the traffic model for the Loma Linda Planning Area was consistent with the proposed General Plan Land Use Program. The roadway network within the City of Loma Linda Planning Area that was ultimately used for the traffic analysis encompasses build out of the City's planned roadway network as shown in the proposed General Plan Master Roadways Map. The results of the technical traffic modeling showed that roadways and highways in Loma Linda will operate at acceptable levels of service with the implementation of the proposed General Plan. The roadway network included a variety of roadway infrastructure improvements in the in the City to enable the network to accommodate travel demand produced by the City's land use plans. The analysis of cumulative future traffic impacts that will be generated at build out of the proposed General Plan demonstrated that, following implementation of General Plan Policies 6.10.1.a through 6.10.1.r, the proposed General Plan will reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level. The policies in the Transportation and Circulation Program set City roadway performance standards to implement the Circulation Plan shown in Figure 6.5. This planned roadway network was used in the TIA conducted by LSA Associates, Inc. The roadway network included a

variety of roadway infrastructure improvements in the City to enable the network to accommodate travel demand produced by the City's proposed General Plan land use plan build out.

The results of the technical traffic modeling performed for the Transportation and Circulation Plan showed that the roadways and highways will operate at an acceptable level of service at the proposed General Plan build out. However, the City of Loma Linda cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges will actually be completed, even if developments in Loma Linda provide fair contributions. In addition, there are no mechanisms in place, nor are any contemplated to be available in the foreseeable future, that would provide for developer contributions to improvements along freeway mainlines. While implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and Draft EIR mitigation measures will reduce impacts along roadways, at intersection and at freeway interchanges to below a level of significance, the implementation of these measures cannot ensure such mitigation for traffic along freeway mainlines, and a significant unavoidable impact will remain. For additional discussion of the project's impacts to transportation and circulation, see Draft EIR Section 4.14.

In October 2005, LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) prepared a revised Trip Generation Analysis for the Loma Linda General Plan as a result of changes to the General Plan land uses since the TIA was approved by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) on May 11, 2004.

The following changes had been made to the land use densities since the General Plan TIA was approved by SANBAG:

- TAZ 290630 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 1,746 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 585 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 1,161 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290771 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 204 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 184 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 20 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290772 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 2,173 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 1,167 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 1,006 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290773 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 523 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 350 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 173 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290781 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 1,392 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 1,366 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 26 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290782 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 954 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 934 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 20 dwelling units.
- TAZ 290790 – In the submitted TIA, it was assumed that this TAZ would have 953 dwelling units. Under the proposed plan, this TAZ will have, under ultimate build out conditions, 461 dwelling units. This leads to a reduction of 492 dwelling units.

The changes in land uses will lead to a forecast reduction of 1,872 trips in the a.m. peak hour, 2,438 trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 24,145 daily trips.

Since the TIA analyzed a higher trip generation (which was used in the EIR), the traffic operations projected in the study represent a worst case condition. Under the proposed land uses, traffic operations would likely be better than or the same as those disclosed in the TIA. Since all study intersections were projected to operate at satisfactory levels of service under the analysis scenarios after the recommended improvements per the TIA, it is expected that the study intersections would continue to operate at satisfactory conditions with the currently proposed land uses.

In January 2006, LSA prepared a supplemental analysis and re-evaluation of seven intersections in the City of Loma Linda that had been analyzed as part of the General Plan update process. These intersections included:

- Barton Road/University Avenue;
- Anderson Street/Redlands Boulevard;
- Anderson Street/Barton Road;
- Benton Street/Prospect Avenue;
- Mountain View Avenue/Redlands Boulevard;
- Mountain View Avenue/Barton Road; and
- California Street/Redlands Boulevard.

These intersections were analyzed using 2003 existing peak hour turn movement traffic volumes in the "Existing Setting" section of the General Plan Circulation Analysis and were found to operate at levels of service (LOS) C and D. These levels of service are considered satisfactory operation in Loma Linda and throughout the west valley area of San Bernardino County; however, discussions with City staff and other stakeholders thought that these intersections (or individual approaches/movements of these intersections) do not exhibit satisfactory operations. This analysis presented a focused re-evaluation of the data, analysis, and model inputs used to arrive at the stated LOS and observations of conditions at the intersections during the critical p.m. peak hour.

In the case of the subject intersections, the 2003 existing setting document concluded that the seven locations were operating at LOS C and LOS D during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. One simple translation is that LOS C represents overall intersection capacity saturation of 70 to 80 percent of the available capacity. LOS D represents overall intersection capacity saturation of 80 to 90 percent of the total intersection capacity. Therefore, while LOS C and D are considered satisfactory from a policy-making position, they do reflect a condition where the majority of the intersection capacity is being used.

The evaluations begin with a review of the mathematical calculations, followed by a presentation of field survey findings. The analysis concluded that there are factors that may affect the operation of individual lane groups and/or approaches during individual signal cycles at the seven subject intersections. The analysis identifies many of these operational issues, such as the formation of queues, which have been included in the overall General Plan Circulation Analysis and in previous analyses.

Because of the specificity of each occurrence (e.g., queue formation for one lane group and peak hour factors associated with specific land uses), the overall average intersection LOS should not be dramatically affected. The LOS reported for the given 2003 traffic volumes surveyed and intersection geometrics observed are fair representation of the prevailing conditions.

Subsequent to the January 2006 report analyzing the traffic patterns at seven intersections, comments from the City staff and other stakeholders raised questions regarding whether the LOS analysis reflected the actual traffic conditions at these intersections. As a result, LSA collected new

traffic count data in January 2006 and performed a revised LOS analysis for the existing traffic conditions at the following four major intersections:

- Anderson Street and Redlands Boulevard;
- Anderson Street and Barton Road;
- Mountain View Avenue and Redlands Boulevard; and
- Mountain View Avenue and Barton Road.

The counts were collected for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours and LOS analysis was performed using Traffix 7.7 and HCM methodologies. This analysis followed a similar procedure to the previous analysis (January 2006), the only difference being the inclusion of minimum green times and peak hour factors at all intersections. These adjustments constrain the calculations and express worse levels of service. The significant change from the 2001 analysis is updated with new traffic counts reflecting five additional years of growth in traffic.

Based on the new LOS analysis, all the intersections have satisfactory LOS conditions. For the a.m. peak hours, Anderson Street/Redlands Boulevard, Anderson Street/Barton Road, and Mountain View Avenue/Redlands Boulevard currently operate at LOS C while Mountain View Avenue/Barton Road operates at LOS D. For p.m. peak hours, Anderson Street/Redlands Boulevard and Anderson Street/Barton Road currently operate at LOS D while Mountain View Avenue/Redlands Boulevard and Mountain View Avenue/Barton Road operate at LOS C.

5.14 Parks and Recreation

Potential Impacts. Implementation of the proposed General Plan will facilitate the development of residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and other types of projects that will result in the increased use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Build out of the proposed Loma Linda General Plan will result in a substantial increase in population, requiring additional parkland and recreational facilities. The increased demand for recreational facilities may result in the need for increased park maintenance and recreational programs and services.

Findings. The City of Loma Linda currently provides only park maintenance services and no recreational programs are offered. As the City population grows with the implementation of the proposed General Plan, the demand for recreational services would increase. Also, as more parks are constructed, the demand for park maintenance will also increase. The proposed General Plan policies anticipate and address the need for increased park maintenance and recreational services in the future. The proposed General Plan policies set forth in the Public Services and Facilities Element identified the need for the City to recognize that high quality maintenance and upkeep of park facilities is necessary for the economic health of the community. In addition, several policies are in place to require the City to develop athletic fields and specialized recreation areas in order to accommodate the growing community needs for such facilities. With the policies covering recreational services and the maintenance of parklands and facilities, the impact to these recreational resources will be reduced to less than significant.

As stated previously, the demand for park maintenance will increase as more parks are constructed. Proposed General Plan policies anticipate and address the need for increased park maintenance and recreational services in the future. Ways to fund these necessary programs are also covered. The performance standards for maintenance of the parkland and facilities are established within the proposed policies. For additional discussion regarding impacts to parks and recreational resources, see DEIR Section 4.15.1.

Facts in Support of Findings. With approximately 75 acres of parkland, the City of Loma Linda has an existing park ratio of 3.8 acres per 1,000 residents (based on 2002 population of 19,636). This is more than the standard of 3.0 acres for every 1,000 residents set forth in the Government Code but less than the standard of 5.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents set forth in current City ordinance and contained in the proposed General Plan.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan is forecast to generate a population of 32,890 at proposed General Plan build out. Based on the City's parkland ratio of 5.0 acres per 1,000 people, the population increase would create a total demand of approximately 165 acres of parkland within the Planning Area. As specified in the proposed General Plan policies, new development shall be required to meet the City standard of 5.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Implementation of the performance standards contained within the proposed General Plan policies related to parks and recreational facilities would minimize the impact of growth and development on parkland and recreational facilities.

I:\General Plan Update\CEQA\Loma Linda FINDINGS 06-13-06.doc



STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN AND RELATED ACTIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The General Plan is the product of a thorough planning and public comment process that involved issues identification, interagency coordination, plan formulation, and multiple public hearings providing for public input and comment. As set forth in the preceding sections, the City Council's approval of the proposed General Plan will result in significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures. All feasible mitigation has been proposed to reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, and no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts without creating new significant adverse impacts. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the City Council chooses to approve the proposed General Plan (Project) because, in its view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the Project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

The following statement identifies why, in the Council's judgment, the benefits of the Project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the entire Project. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section.

2.0 SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Council finds that the General Plan would have the following economic, social, and environmental benefits:

2.1 Improving the Jobs-Housing Balance in the Region

The jobs-to-housing ratio measures the extent to which job opportunities in a given geographic area are sufficient to meet the employment needs of area residents. This ratio identifies the number of jobs available in a given region compared to the number of housing units in the same region, and determines potential imbalances between housing and employment opportunities. In theory, if households have job opportunities closer to where they live, this can potentially reduce overall commuting. Longer commutes result in increased vehicle trip length, which creates environmental effects associated with transportation, air quality, and noise.

The City of Loma Linda is considered a "jobs rich" community as the number of jobs available in the City totaled 14,733 in 2000 (as determined by the 2001 RTP Growth Forecast) while the number of employed persons over the age of 16 living within the City totaled 8,679 (according to the 2000 Census). However, unlike many communities with substantial local employment, a large percentage of Loma Linda's workforce is already employed locally. Loma Linda University and associated medical institutions along with the Veterans Hospital are the largest employers in the City providing employment in the fields of education, health, and social services. As shown in the 2000 Census, 54 percent of the residents of City of Loma Linda are employed in these fields.



The SCAG employment projections for 2025 exceed the projections of the proposed General Plan by 46.5 percent. The proposed General Plan does not project proposed land uses to produce as many jobs as anticipated by SCAG. While the number of jobs in the City is forecast to increase, the number will not be as great as expected regionally. On the other hand, the number of dwelling units expected in 2025 by the General Plan is much closer to the SCAG forecast number. While 17,261 housing units will be developed in the City by the General Plan build out, job opportunities in the City are expected to total about 27,564, which are more than 1.6 jobs for every household.

Even though the City of Loma Linda is expected to have many more jobs than households by 2025, the other cities within Loma Linda's Regional Statistical Area are expected to have a large percentage more households than jobs. Within the region, SCAG projects the number of households and jobs to balance by 2025. The SCAG 2001 RTP projects that, as a whole, the Regional Statistical Area that Loma Linda is in will have more than 300,000 jobs and more than 300,000 households by 2025. Because Loma Linda's numerous jobs will help to balance the numerous households in surrounding cities, a balance between the number of jobs and households will exist within the region by 2025, and the jobs within Loma Linda will have a beneficial effect on the region. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed General Plan will help to balance land uses regionally and no impact associated with this issue would occur.

The land use designations and policies of the proposed General Plan have been tailored to improve the balance between local employment and housing opportunities, thereby reducing commute times and distances between residential developments and employment centers, and associated environmental effects such as noise, air quality, and traffic.

The City of Loma Linda's hillside backdrop is highly prized by its residents. The residents passed the Hillside Preservation Initiative in 1993 to preserve the significant natural hillside amenities within the boundaries of the City. Additionally, the City's slogan is based upon the City's unique setting – "*A City with a View*". Conserving and protecting the hillsides along with the quality and quantity of clean air, native plant and wildlife species, water resources, and historic resources is a significant ingredient in the well being of the City and its residents. Also as the City becomes more built-out, the pressure to develop the hillsides will increase. Conservation of the hillsides should remain a part of the long-range plan for the hillside areas.

2.2 Diversification and Expansion of the City's Housing Stock

The proposed General Plan contains a number of policies which, when implemented, would serve to diversify and expand the City's housing stock. For example, within the Housing Program, there are policies that encourage both housing affordable to lower income households, seniors, and other special needs groups who often have difficulty obtaining and keeping housing, and housing for moderate and above moderate-income households.

It is important that a variety of housing types and styles of residential development be provided, including rental and starter housing, as well as housing for young growing families, empty nesters, and the elderly. In 2000, almost one-quarter of Loma Linda's population was under the age of 20, compared to 35.6 percent countywide, while 15.4 percent of the population was 65 years old or over. This indicates that Loma Linda is still within its "growth" stage, attracting young families. Population growth projections for the City indicate that this trend toward attracting young families will continue for the next 20 years.

Loma Linda's population has a higher percentage of households earning more than 95 percent of the median income than that of San Bernardino County as a whole. However, the City has a much lower percentage of households with a moderate income (80-120% of median income) than the County as



a whole. The differences in households that are very low and low-income are small, which indicates that the City provides housing for approximately the same percentage of very low and low-income households as do other communities in the County.

Provisions of the Housing Program provide specific action programs to facilitate the provision of housing for all economic segments of the community, aimed at meeting Loma Linda's fair share of regional housing needs. The General Plan also provides for large-scale planned communities in the Land Use Program which will provide high level amenities and move-up housing in close proximity to jobs in the City and the region. The planned communities will thus assist in reducing travel time which will lower vehicle emissions that cause air pollution.

2.3 Improvement to Roadways

While the region as a whole is expected to grow significantly over the life of the planning period, improving the jobs-housing balance within the City, will improve projected traffic within the City and along the region's roadway system, even as the number of vehicles on the road increases with population growth. Without the policies of the proposed General Plan promoting these benefits, the condition of roadways within the Planning Area could be expected to become much worse as the inevitable population growth occurs. Circulation Program policies, for example, aim to reduce reliance on automobiles, thereby reducing the burden on area roadways, while Land Use policies seek to improve the area's jobs/housing balance. It should be noted that the traffic analysis prepared for the proposed General Plan does not include construction of the proposed Bi-County Corridor. There were two traffic analyses prepared for the General Plan. The two studies included the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) January 2004 that was approved by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) on May 11, 2004 and a revised Trip Generation Analysis prepared in October 2005 for the Loma Linda General Plan as a result of changes to the General Plan land uses since the TIA was approved. The two studies further support the Draft General Plan policies.

The City facilitates pedestrian travel through the design of pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods with well-connected streets and sidewalks. The City also provides convenient and safe sidewalk routes to shopping, schools and recreation areas. One such route connects Hulda Crooks Park to Beaumont Avenue thus encouraging pedestrian travel. In addition, the City provides an off-road trail system designed for walking and hiking activities. The Conservation and Open Space Element includes the Trails Plan which covers the City and sphere of influence. One of these proposed pedestrian trails is the Edison Easement Trail, which is partially complete, and parallels Mountain Avenue between Redlands Boulevard and Beaumont Avenue. Other examples include the encouragement of rider-ship on public transit through use of City information sources (e.g., City web site, and mail-outs) to provide information on transit services and the possible creation of a multi-modal transportation center to serve the downtown area and nearby medical and educational facilities.

2.4 Protection of Significant Environmental Features

The City of Loma Linda's hillside backdrop is highly prized by its residents. The residents passed the Hillside Preservation Initiative in 1993 to preserve the significant natural hillside amenities within the boundaries of the City. Additionally, the City's slogan is based upon the City's unique setting – "*A City with a View*". Conserving and protecting the hillsides along with the quality and quantity of clean air, native plant and wildlife species, water resources, and historic resources is a significant ingredient in the well being of the City and its residents. Also as the City becomes more built-out, the pressure to develop the hillsides will increase. Conservation of the hillsides should remain a part of the long-range plan for the hillside areas.



The proposed General Plan contains several policies that focus on preserving open space as a significant environmental feature. The General Plan identifies the permanent nature of the land use designation and further emphasizes that open space is not a temporary “holding zone.” Ensuring these benefits now, before population pressures become even greater, and the political will to avoid developing these areas perhaps weakens, is especially important. The General Plan sets forth policies that will function as environmental performance standards to ensure the protection of significant environmental features, such as open space and biological resources. These policies also address certain specific environmental features such as the need to maintain a permanent open space in the South Hills. The General Plan also requires the development projects be directed away from lands with sensitive biological resources to the extent feasible.

2.5 Provision for Public Services and Facilities

The General Plan ensures that the expansion of public facilities will occur in an equitable manner, and that new development provides the on- and off-site facilities needed to support the development in a manner that avoids increased costs for and reductions in the level of public services provided to existing residents and businesses.

2.6 Fiscal and Economic Considerations

The General Plan supports the retention and development of Loma Linda University Medical Center and J.L. Pettis Veterans Memorial Medical Center to assist in maintaining the long-term economic viability of the City. Additionally, the General Plan seeks to expand upon these economic assets while also diversifying the local economy. The General Plan recognizes that Long-term economic stability strengthens the stability and predictability of municipal costs and revenues. The General Plan also provides for economic growth through encouraging retail opportunities to create a downtown area or city center, which could provide a focal point for the community. A vibrant downtown area would confer a sense of place that would strengthen the community’s image and encourage residents as well as visitors and workers to shop, dine, and pursue leisure activities locally. As the roots of the community are associated with Loma Linda University, the downtown could be located near the University at Anderson Street and Prospect Street. Creating a downtown would entail, among other actions, expanding the services and businesses presently in the area, providing public parking and improving access to the area for both students and the general community of Loma Linda.

The General Plan supports attracting and assisting the relocation and expansion of firms in high-tech, biotech, research and development, and retail trade and services. Capitalizing on Loma Linda’s identity in the healing arts by working with the Loma Linda University Medical Center and the Veterans Hospital Administration to identify health services-related firms and trade organizations that could benefit from locating in Loma Linda. Such businesses might include those involved in medical research and clinical trials, and research, development and testing of medical equipment, as well as vendors to these and other medical facilities.

The General Plan also supports actively seeking larger retail businesses the City lacks; such as Home Furnishing and Appliance Stores, Hardware and Building Materials, expanded Auto Dealerships, and Supermarkets to locate on Redlands Boulevard. The General Plan also supports working with private sector entities to identify and implement advanced infrastructure technologies that will facilitate the relocation of technology-related businesses to Loma Linda, as well as the expansion of existing businesses. And working with the private sector to maintain an adequate supply of skilled workers and the capital needed to attract and maintain business in Loma Linda. The General Plan also provide sufficient land to accommodate planned development, with office, business



park, and commercial areas complementing residential and public development in location, access, mix of uses, attractiveness, and design quality.

As a means of financing infrastructure for future development, the General Plan requires new development to pay for its fair share of new infrastructure, public and community facilities, and the incremental operating costs it imposes on the City.

3.0 ADDITIONAL OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Following is a summary of the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project and a description of the overriding considerations for each of the unavoidable, significant impacts.

3.1 Aesthetic and Visual Resources

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact. Conversion of open space to urban uses.

Overriding Considerations. The Planning Area currently contains 2,450.3 acres of open space and undeveloped parcels in the hillsides. Build out of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in urban uses throughout the proposed General Plan area. The development of structures and facilities would occur on vacant properties and would be consistent with the policies outlined in the proposed General Plan. The conversion of open space to urban uses would result in a significant impact by causing the obstruction of existing open views as well as potentially obstructing distant panoramic views to the south from existing development; therefore, implementation of the proposed General Plan will contribute to the loss of visual character of the City as well as loss of open space. While it is not possible to mitigate this impact to a level of insignificance, approval of the proposed General Plan would assist in protecting and preserving a large portion of the open space land through maintaining a permanent open space, including a broad area of the South Hills. Other benefits of the proposed General Plan related to protecting open space include the following:

- Development shall be clustered in the less sensitive and more developable portions of the site as a means of preserving the natural appearance of area hillsides, open space, and habitats. Under this concept, dwelling units and other forms of development are to be grouped in the more level and less environmentally sensitive portions of the site, while steeper and more environmentally sensitive areas are preserved in a natural state. The effect of permitted clustering is to preserve natural open space, enhance the protection of sensitive environmental resources within a development project, and facilitate the permanent protection of key natural features, such as steep slopes, biological habitats, ridgelines, and scenic areas. Clustering is not to be used to increase the overall density of an area beyond that which is otherwise permitted by the General Plan and applicable zoning regulations, but may result in urban density development within portions of a site that would otherwise have rural densities.
 - The location of clustered units is to be restricted to portions of a site less with than a 35 percent slope where sites have sufficient relatively flat areas to accommodate the development. Within sites comprising primarily or exclusively areas with slopes greater than 35 percent, the location of clustered units shall be designed to preserve open space, reduce necessary grading, and protect visual and biological resources.
 - Within clustered development sites, development may be sited on mass graded pads, provided that the overall project results in the permanent preservation of large blocks of natural open space. Where individual clusters of development will exceed 100 to 200



dwelling units in size, such clusters should be separated from each other by natural open space, resulting in an interwoven mosaic natural and developed land.

- Adequate legal provisions shall be made to ensure the preservation of open space areas in perpetuity.
- When viewed from the valley floor to the north, clustered subdivisions should have no greater visual impacts than would a non-clustered development.
- When clustered development is used, site the development in order to maintain a visual open space throughout the development, and preserve the undeveloped portion of the land as open space in perpetuity;
- Site new development so as to maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources;
- The interface between new development and natural open space shall be designed to provide a gradual transition from manufactured areas into natural areas. By extending fingers of planting into existing enjoyed from existing dwellings;
- Design new development so as to maximize the permanent preservation of open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources;
- Acquire, preserve and maintain open space and its natural resources for future generations;
- Base open space preservation and acquisition on the evaluation of significant view sheds and ridgelines, wildlife habitats and fragile ecosystems, significant scientifically, historically, or ecologically unique natural areas, passive recreational areas, and stream or creek environs;
- Encourage, through open space easements, development rights transfers or acquisition, or other incentives, the long-term maintenance of existing and future open space lands. Encourage acquisition and/or a land exchange program to place some of the Hillside Conservation Area in public ownership to be kept as open space;
- To the extent legally possible, require other local, regional, State, or Federal agencies to maintain an adequate inventory of open space lands within Loma Linda;
- Coordinate through development review, Loma Linda's open space system with adjacent cities, San Bernardino County, the State, and regional and private open space systems in order to connect the systems and share resources;
- Utilize the resource of national, regional and local conservation organizations, corporations, non-profit associations and benevolent entities to acquire environmentally sensitive land or preservation areas;
- The San Jacinto Fault Zone area should be preserved as open space through easement dedication during the review process of applicable new developments;
- Limit culverts or the channeling of creeks to only those situations in which public health and safety are at risk so as to preserve creeks and their natural habitat for open space;
- Encourage access to open space areas in the design of development adjacent to open space, such as a trail; and
- Continue to require through development standards, the integration of open space and recreational uses and facilities in all multiple-family residential projects.



Conclusion. Based upon the previously described social, economic, and other benefits or considerations of the Project and the additional overriding considerations described above, the benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh the impact related to the loss of open space and any adverse environmental effects associated with this impact are considered to be acceptable.

3.2 Air Quality

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact. Implementation of the General Plan will exceed local and regional air quality standards for fugitive dust and mobile source emissions during construction and long-term mobile source emissions resulting in a worsening of air quality.

Overriding Considerations. The South Coast Air Basin is the largest basin in the State and has been designated by the Environmental Protection Agency as non-attainment for 8-hour ozone and PM_{2.5}. Thus, a significant air quality problem exists now in the non-desert area of San Bernardino County which will persist for a number of years whether or not there is significant growth in the Loma Linda Planning Area. Also, urban growth will likely occur in communities surrounding the City of Loma Linda irrespective of the adoption of the proposed General Plan. Air quality is a regional problem that does not respect jurisdictional or planning area boundaries. Continuing urban growth, whether it occurs in the Loma Linda Planning Area or in other areas, will contribute to the regional air quality problem in roughly the same manner.

The adoption of the proposed General Plan, which includes policies that provide positive actions toward a comprehensive strategy dealing with air quality and are provided below, will be beneficial to the regional air quality program. These policies incorporate the majority of the goals, policies, and programs identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The beneficial General Plan policies include the following:

- Encouraging developers of large residential and non-residential projects to participate in programs and to take measures to improve traffic flow and/or reduce vehicle trips resulting in decreased vehicular emissions;
- Supporting and facilitating employer-based trip reductions programs by recognizing such programs as mitigation for traffic and air quality impacts where their ongoing implementation can be ensured;
- Expand intersections to include additional turning and through lanes at intersections where needed to relieve congestion and improve intersection operation, so long as the intersection can continue to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. Avoid traffic system improvements that facilitate vehicular turning and bus movements, but that also discourage pedestrian or bicycle movements;
- Design new residential neighborhoods to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access to schools, parks and neighborhood commercial facilities through explicit development requirements for such amenities;
- Maintain roadway designs that maintain mobility and accessibility for bicyclists and pedestrians through incorporation of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, where appropriate;
- Where shopping facilities are located adjacent to residential areas, provide direct access between residential and commercial uses without requiring pedestrians and bicyclists to travel completely around the commercial development through stipulations in the design review process;



- Ensure that the site design of new developments provides for pedestrian access to existing and future transit routes and transit centers through specific review during the development review process;
- Encourage rider-ship on public transit through use of City information sources (e.g., City web site, and mail-outs) to provide information on transit services;
- Encourage associated health care facilities and services to locate within close proximity of each other and require pedestrian connections (and bicycle paths, where appropriate) between such uses in order to limit necessary vehicle trips for patients, visitors, health care workers, and health care students;
- Provide increased access by designing pedestrian linkages from the adjacent residential cul-de-sacs to the trail system;
- Site all residential uses to facilitate pedestrian access to the park from the residential areas;
- Provide the residential uses with easy access to the planned recreation trail running north and south through the city (located approximately one half mile east of Mountain View Avenue), such as by placing trail connections at the end of cul-de-sacs;
- Provide individual neighborhoods with pathways and open spaces that connect residences to school and recreational facilities, thereby facilitating pedestrian and bicycle access;
- Promote the establishment of workplace alternatives, including home occupations and telecommuting to reduce peak hour congestion. Continue to allow home occupations in all residential districts;
- Explore the creation of a multi-modal transportation center to serve the downtown area and nearby medical and educational facilities; and
- Look for participation opportunities with potential transit center development, destination use development in the South Hills, San Timoteo Creek joint development uses, and similar opportunities.

Conclusion. Based upon the previously described social, economic, and other benefits or considerations of the Project and the additional overriding considerations described above, the benefits of the of the proposed General Plan outweigh the impact related to air quality and any adverse environmental effects associated with this impact are considered to be acceptable.

3.3 Biological Resources

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would cause direct loss of sensitive critical habitat or cause habitat fragmentation resulting in isolation of sensitive habitat patches which are of limited biological value.

Overriding Considerations. Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the direct loss of 1,437.5 acres of sensitive habitat. The CDFG, through its NDDDB, tracks the occurrence of natural communities which it considers to be the most sensitive in the state. As conditions change over time, conservation efforts may lead to habitat types being added to or removed from the set of habitats considered sensitive. Construction of proposed General Plan land uses may result in the loss or fragmentation of sensitive habitat(s).



Determining if the impact is significant at the level of site-specific projects that are proposed in accordance with the proposed General Plan land uses will require analysis as part of the subsequent evaluation of such projects. The potential for such impacts to be considered significant will depend upon various factors including, but not limited to, the site conditions at the time of project evaluation, the extent of the area potentially affected, the quality of the habitat being affected, and the value of the affected habitat at local and regional scales. As land use proceeds under implementation of the proposed General Plan, patches of habitat on undeveloped properties will initially be fragmented by the sporadic pattern of development. However, once the proposed General Plan reaches build out, the only fragmented patches remaining would be those set aside within a project site as on-site mitigation or due to development constraints (e.g., steep slopes), or both. Thus, the initial fragmentation of undeveloped properties would be an interim condition with the long-term fragmentation occurring under total build out. Regional fragmentation will occur as existing biological reserves and other conservation lands (e.g., San Timoteo Canyon State Park) become surrounded and isolated by community and rural development. The proposed General Plan will create habitat fragmentation resulting in isolation of sensitive habitat patches creating a "checkerboard" pattern of small habitat patches of limited biological value.

The proposed General Plan policies focus primarily on avoidance and minimization of impacts to floodplain, riparian, and wetland habitats; maintaining and conserving superior examples of native vegetation. The policies provide for avoidance and minimization of impacts to some sensitive habitats. The adoption of the proposed General Plan, which includes policies that provide positive actions toward a comprehensive strategy dealing with biological resources and are provided below, will be beneficial to the critical habitat and cause habitat fragmentation. The beneficial General Plan policies include the following:

- Development shall be clustered in the less sensitive and more developable portions of the site as a means of preserving the natural appearance of area hillsides, open space, and habitats. Under this concept, dwelling units and other forms of development are to be grouped in the more level and less environmentally sensitive portions of the site, while steeper and more environmentally sensitive areas are preserved in a natural state. The effect of permitted clustering is to preserve natural open space, enhance the protection of sensitive environmental resources within a development project, and facilitate the permanent protection of key natural features, such as steep slopes, biological habitats, ridgelines, and scenic areas. Clustering is not to be used to increase the overall density of an area beyond that which is otherwise permitted by the General Plan and applicable zoning regulations, but may result in urban density development within portions of a site that would otherwise have rural densities;
- Site new development so as to maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources;
- Acquire, preserve and maintain open space and its natural resources for future generations;
- Base open space preservation and acquisition on the evaluation of significant view sheds and ridgelines, wildlife habitat and fragile ecosystems, significant scientifically, historically, or ecologically unique natural areas, passive recreational areas, and stream or creek environs;
- Preserve habitats supporting rare and endangered species of plants and animals including wildlife corridors;
- Comply with the Federal policy of no net loss of wetlands through avoidance and clustered development. Where preservation in place is found to be infeasible (such as an unavoidable a road crossing through habitats), require 1) on-site replacement of wetland areas, 2) off-site replacement, or 3) restoration of degraded wetland areas at a minimum ratio of one acre of



replacement/restoration for each acre of impacted on-site habitat, such that the value of impacted habitat is replaced;

- Require appropriate setbacks adjacent to natural streams to provide adequate buffer areas ensuring the projection of biological resources;
- Through the project approval and design review processes, require new development projects to protect sensitive habitat areas, including, but not limited to, coastal sage scrub, and native grasslands. Ensure the preservation in place of habitat areas found to be occupied by state and federally protected species. Where preserved habitat areas occupy areas that would otherwise be graded as part of a development project, facilitate the transfer of allowable density to other, non-sensitive portions of the site;
- Through development review, retain, as feasible, wildlife corridors in the Planning Area in particular, the San Timoteo Wash area;
- Base open space preservation and acquisition on the evaluation of significant view sheds and ridgelines, wildlife habitats and fragile ecosystems, significant scientifically, historically, or ecologically unique natural areas, passive recreational areas, and stream or creek environs;
- Encourage, through open space easements, development rights transfers or acquisition, or other incentives, the long-term maintenance of existing and future open space lands. Encourage acquisition and/or a land exchange program to place some of the Hillside Conservation Area in public ownership to be kept as open space;
- To the extent legally possible, require other local, regional, State, or Federal agencies to maintain an adequate inventory of open space lands within Loma Linda;
- Coordinate through development review, Loma Linda's open space system with adjacent cities, San Bernardino County, the State, and regional and private open space systems in order to connect the systems and share resources; and
- Utilize the resource of national, regional and local conservation organizations, corporations, non-profit associations and benevolent entities to acquire environmentally sensitive land or preservation areas.

The following mitigation measures are also proposed to address impacts to critical habitat and habitat fragmentation.

- Require the preparation of biological reports in compliance with standards established by the City of Loma Linda for development related uses that require discretionary approval to assess the impacts of such development and provide mitigation for impacts to biological resources. The report must be prepared by a qualified biologist; the City Community Development Department must be notified in advance that a report will be prepared for a specific project; the report must include a signed certification attesting to the report contents, specific information as to the type of survey (e.g., General Biological Resources Assessment, Habitat Assessment, etc.), site location, property owner. In addition, the report must include the following:
 - a. Specified attachments (summary sheet, level of significance checklist, biological resources/project footprint map, and site photos);
 - b. Information on literature sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and environmental documents for nearby projects);
 - c. A description of surveys, including timing, personnel, and weather conditions;



- d. A description of site conditions including plant and wildlife habitat, disturbances, and sensitive elements;
 - e. An assessment of anticipated project impacts and a discussion of mitigation;
 - f. A list of all species observed or detected and a recommendation for any additional focused surveys that may be necessary.
- The City establishes baseline ratios for mitigating the impacts of development related uses to rare, threatened and endangered species and their associated habitats as the following:
 - Preserve habitat at minimum of 1:1 replacement ratio in locations that provide long-term conservation value for impacted resources. This could involve acquisition of habitat occupied by the affected species, acquiring a key parcel that fills in a missing link or gap in a reserve that provides conservation for the species, or acquisition of credits in a mitigation bank (endorsed by the USFWS and/or CDFG) that has been established to provide conservation value for the species. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.

Conclusion. Based upon the previously described social, economic, and other benefits or considerations of the Project and the additional overriding considerations described above, the benefits of the of the proposed General Plan outweigh the impact related to the loss of critical habitat and habitat fragmentation in the Planning Area outside of the City limits and the sphere of influence and any adverse environmental effects associated with this impact are considered to be acceptable.

3.4 Water Resources

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the existing demand for water thereby reducing water availability to, or interfering with, existing users of well water.

Overriding Considerations. With increased development in the Planning Area, anticipated with the implementation of the General Plan Update, water resources will continue to diminish not only for the City of Loma Linda but also for the rest of the communities in Southern California. Although the City of Loma Linda has ascertained that there is presently enough water supply in the Bunker Hills basin to serve its future needs, the City is not the only community using that basin for water supplies. As the rest of the region grows and as the native water supply decreases, the region's dependence on imported water grows and water conservation, including the use of reclaimed water and control of water runoff pollution becomes critical to not only Loma Linda but the entire region. The City has identified the provision and protection of water resources as one of prime importance in the implementation of the General Plan Update. While the proposed General Plan policies recognize the water supply issues and encourage the use of water conservation measures, they do not assure the provision of water supplies adequate to support development that may occur as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan Update.

The adoption of the proposed General Plan, which includes policies that provide positive actions toward a comprehensive strategy dealing with water supply and conservation efforts and are provided below, will be beneficial to the City's need for potable water. The beneficial General Plan policies include the following:



- Provide a water system that supplies high quality water to serve existing and future needs of the City during peak use conditions, with sufficient water in storage reservoirs for emergency and fire protection;
- Ensure that adequate water supply capacity and infrastructure is in place prior to occupancy of new development;
- Update the City's Water Master Plan as needed, with a review occurring at least every five years;
- Encourage water conservation as a means of preserving water resources. Require new development to be equipped with water conservation devices;
- Ensure that an adequate supply of water is available to serve existing and future needs of the City;
- Develop and encourage the implementation of water conservation programs by residents, employers, students, and service providers;
- Participate with State and regional agencies to monitor groundwater supplies and take steps to prevent overuse, depletion, and toxicity;
- Encourage sustainable landscapes or landscapes that require little irrigation through the use of drought-tolerant and native vegetation in new development;
- Through the development review process require that water supply capacity is available or will be available prior to approval of a development project;
- Pursue the use of reclaimed water for the irrigation of all appropriate open space facilities and City projects, and encourage existing and new developments to tie to the reclaim water system when available and recommended by the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department; and
- Through the development review process, encourage water conservation in all new and rehabilitated development through the use of water conserving fixtures in residential and commercial development.

Conclusion. Based upon the previously described social, economic, and other benefits or considerations of the Project and the additional overriding considerations described above, the benefits of the of the proposed General Plan outweigh the impact related to water resources and any adverse environmental effects associated with this impact are considered to be acceptable.

3.5 Traffic

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in traffic volumes which could result in congestion along area roadways and the I-10 freeway.

Overriding Considerations. The traffic impact analysis (TIA) undertaken for the General Plan sets forth a number of measures that, when implemented, will maintain service level standards along all roadways and highways that will be affected by the Loma Linda General Plan. However, the City of Loma Linda cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges will actually be completed, even if developments in Loma Linda provide fair share contributions. In addition, there are no mechanisms in place, nor are any contemplated to be available in the foreseeable future, that would provide for developer contributions to improvements along freeway mainlines. The General Plan and TIA does include policies that will reduce the traffic impacts on area roadways and are as follows:



- Facilitate roadway capacity by implementing the Loma Linda Circulation Plan.
 - Pursue the Evans Street interchange and roadway extension.
 - Although included in regional funding for additional lanes, maintain a four-lane divided highway on Redlands Boulevard except at intersection of Anderson Street where additional through lanes will be necessary.
 - Provide access to new development in the southern hills via Oakwood Drive, with emergency access connection to Reche Canyon;
- Promote the design of roadways to optimize safe traffic flow within established roadway configurations by minimizing driveways and intersections, uncontrolled access to adjacent parcels, on-street parking, and frequent stops to the extent consistent with the character of adjacent land uses;
- As development occurs, provide adequate capacity at intersections to accommodate future traffic volumes by installing intersection traffic improvements and traffic control devices, as needed.
 - At the intersection of California Street and Redlands Boulevard, add additional lanes as necessary.
 - At the intersection of Benton Street and Barton Road, provide additional lanes when necessary.
 - Provide additional lanes at Anderson Street and Redlands Boulevard to accommodate traffic as needed.
 - Provide two-way center left turn lane at the intersection of the proposed Evans Street as needed.
 - Realign Mission Road intersection to coincide with Orange Avenue intersection.
- Facilitate the synchronization of traffic signals along Redlands Boulevard, Barton Road, Anderson Street, and Mountain View Avenue;
- Require the provision of reciprocal access and parking agreements between adjacent land uses where appropriate to facilitate off-street vehicular movement between adjacent commercial and other non-residential uses, and to reduce the number of driveways along major roadways;
- Encourage regional goods movement to remain on area freeways and other appropriate routes;
- Require the design of new developments to focus through traffic onto arterial streets, and away from local neighborhoods;
- Require that existing driveways that are unnecessary or substandard be removed or upgraded, wherever feasible, in conjunction with any on-site development or any adjacent street construction;
- Where single-family residences have no feasible alternative but to front on collector or arterial roadways, require, wherever possible, that circular driveways or on-site turnarounds be provided to eliminate the need for residents to back onto the street;
- Locate driveways on corner parcels as far away from the intersection as is possible;
- Avoid locating driveways within passenger waiting areas of bus stops or within bus bays. Locate driveways so that drivers will be able to see around bus stop improvements;
- Where a series of traffic signals is provided along a route, facilitate the coordination of traffic signals to optimize traffic progression on a given route. Traffic signalization should emphasize



facilitating access from neighborhood areas onto the City's primary roadway network, and should work to discourage through traffic from using local streets;

- Expand intersections to include additional turning and through lanes at intersections where needed to relieve congestion and improve intersection operation, so long as the intersection can continue to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. Avoid traffic system improvements that facilitate vehicular turning and bus movements, but that also discourage pedestrian or bicycle movements;
- Maintain the first priority for public streets of providing safe and efficient travel for the public with on-street parking as a second priority;
- Pursue construction of parking structures within the downtown area to serve projected parking demand and facilitate mixed-use development without the need to meet off-street parking standards on each individual parcel;
- Work with the Loma Linda University/Medical Center to provide a direct connection of Van Leuven Street to Anderson Street, preferably at the existing intersection of Academy Street;
- Work with the Loma Linda Academy to modify its entry to provide stacking room for parents' vehicles waiting to drop off or pick up students; and
- As part of the development of the mixed-use area west of California Street, realign Mission Road to connect to Orange Street. West of California Street, design the realigned Mission Road to maximize access to lands north of Barton Road.

The following mitigation measure is also proposed to address identified traffic impacts.

- Individual development projects undertaken pursuant to the General Plan shall be required to provide roadway/intersection improvements or provide a fair share contribution toward such improvements as are needed to maintain applicable Level of Service standards on roadway links, intersections, and at freeway interchanges. For impacts on roadways and intersections outside of the City of Loma Linda, as well as for freeway interchanges, implementation of the requirement to provide improvements or fair share contributions shall be predicated on the commitment of the agency controlling the roadway, intersection, or interchange to commit to completing the improvement.

Conclusion. Based upon the previously described social, economic, and other benefits or considerations of the Project and the additional overriding considerations described above, the benefits of the of the proposed General Plan outweigh the impact related to increase traffic and any adverse environmental effects associated with this impact are considered to be acceptable.